Prevent and counter-extremism in general further education colleges

Research report

December 2018

John Higton, Dr. Rupal Patel, Irshad Mulla, Nariah Francis and Arifa Choudhoury; CFE Research

Dr. Benedict Wilkinson, Dr. Mary Baginsky, Armida van Rij; King's College London

Contents

List of tables

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

The Department for Education (DfE) commissioned CFE Research (CFE) to undertake this study to explore how general further education (GFE) colleges have approached and responded to the Prevent duty. The findings will help DfE to better understand whether GFE colleges have the support, training and resources they need to enact their duties. This report summarises the findings from this research and offers insight(s) into the impact of enacting the Prevent duty on learners.

Background to the study

In July 2015, a legal duty was implemented placing a statutory duty on FE providers to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism' (Counter Terrorism and Security Act, 2015)[1].

In 2016, Ofsted published a report[2], showcasing an early snapshot of the first few months after the duty came into force in FE. The Ofsted report stated that the majority of providers had made good progress in implementing the Prevent duty, but a number were struggling and consequently leaving their learners at risk of radicalisation and extremism. Despite some development, Ofsted felt that many providers saw their Prevent duties as little more than a 'tick-box exercise' and did not regard it as an important part of their responsibilities towards learners.

In addition, wider evidence on the role and impact of Prevent in FE is limited; in particular there is only a small amount of empirical evidence describing how learners develop perceptions of Prevent and the impact of the Prevent duty on learners. Therefore, further research was needed to provide information on how GFE colleges have made progress in implementing the duty since the report was published by Ofsted in 2016.

Focus of this report

This report adds to the evidence base on how staff and learners in GFE colleges have understood, implemented and experienced the statutory duty of Prevent. In particular, the research investigated:

---

[1] HM Government (2015) Counter-Terrorism and Security Act: Document collection.
[2] Ofsted (2016) How well are further education and skills providers implementing the 'Prevent' duty?

- Perceptions of the Prevent duty and other related policy (e.g. the promotion of fundamental British values) among GFE college leaders, teachers, support staff and learners;

- College leaders' and teachers' understanding of how Prevent is implemented and embedded in GFE colleges; and,

- The perceptions of the impact of the policy on learners among all staff types and learners.

Overall, this study forms part of a programme of work to improve the evidence base on the implementation of Prevent in FE. Exploring enactment of the Prevent duty in GFE colleges will help government understand the impact of their support and interventions to date; and identify key challenges and areas that may require further intervention.

Method

The core method consisted of day-long case study visits to 20 GFE colleges in England, on which the findings are based. The key sample characteristics of the GFE colleges involved in the study are:

- Geographical location incorporating those based in Home Office Priority Local Authority (LA) or Unitary Authority (UA) Areas[3]; those based in LAs/UAs adjacent to a Priority Area; and, those situated elsewhere[4].

- The most recent Ofsted rating: outstanding, good, satisfactory or inadequate. A spread of colleges was sought based on this rating, but no college with an inadequate Ofsted rating responded to the invitation email and were therefore not represented in the research sample.

- A mix of colleges based on two other criteria: rurality and the size of the college.

CFE recruited institutions to take part in the study by telephone after an initial invitation email was sent to the sample from DfE. The fieldwork in each of the 20 GFE colleges participating in this study included:

- depth-interviews with a senior leader to understand the college's strategic approach to implementing the Prevent duty;

---

[3] Home Office devised local authorities (local council areas) or unitary areas (local authorities that have a single tier) into priority areas based on the risk of where extremism is of most concern.
[4] These areas are situated in neither priority areas nor are they adjacent to a priority area.

- on-site small focus-groups/interviews with teaching staff, support staff, and learners; and,

- telephone interviews with stakeholders to gain a deeper insight into partnership working and how it contributes to effective implementation of the Prevent duty.

It is important to highlight the limitations of the findings, given the methods that were adopted. The sampling strategy was designed to compare GFE colleges based on criteria that may have some bearing on implementing Prevent. Furthermore, no GFE colleges with an 'inadequate' Ofsted rating were involved in the study. CFE Research did not pursue inadequate colleges beyond the initial invitation email because of the pressures such providers are often under. Although the sample size was limited, the findings provide insight into the breadth and depth of issues involved, which constitutes an important contribution to the developing evidence-base around Prevent in FE.

Key findings

The main findings are summarised below, presented under the key themes that emerged during the analysis.

Development of approach to embedding Prevent and policy/strategy documents

1. Prevent is aligned with other safeguarding activity. This results in the prioritisation of learner safety and facilitates the implementation of Prevent duties.

- Prevent is viewed and approached as a form of safeguarding and the priority for senior leaders is to protect and keep learners safe. Consequently, Prevent is embedded in existing safeguarding policies which have facilitated implementation processes.

2. There is a disconnect between the perceptions of senior leaders and staff (teachers and support staff) on the purpose and relevance of policy documents.

- Senior leaders developed policy and strategy documents to provide their staff with guidance to implement the Prevent duty. However, the majority of teachers and support staff across most GFE colleges reported that their responsibility was to safeguard learners and to do this they did not feel it was necessary to have in-depth knowledge of the wider action plans senior leaders at their college were developing. Rather, for these teachers and support staff it was crucial to have the practical knowledge of the referral process that directly enables them to respond to safeguarding issues. The majority of teachers and support staff felt that the

training they received and the support they gained from line managers was sufficient without needing to continually review strategy documents.

3. The lack of representation of teachers and support staff in policy working-groups could contribute to a disconnect between senior leaders and their staff.

- All senior leaders (generally safeguarding leads) indicated they had ultimate responsibility for developing policy and strategy documents for their colleges. Although some colleges sought guidance from external sources e.g. regional Prevent FE/HE coordinators, all teachers and support staff emphasised they did not contribute to this process and found policy documents irrelevant for their roles. However, senior leaders felt policy documents were crucial to informing staff about their approach to Prevent. This implies that if teachers and support staff are to fully engage with written policies, it may be necessary to involve teachers and support staff in the policy development process.

4. External support from local authorities and regional Prevent FE/HE coordinators was well-received, but only accessed by proactive senior leaders seeking support or where they had pre-existing networks with local authorities and Prevent FE/HE coordinators.

- Some senior leaders that have received strategic guidance and support from FE/HE regional Prevent coordinators largely found this support positive. As these coordinators cover large geographical areas spanning numerous colleges, FE/HE regional Prevent coordinators reported using an 'open-door' system whereby senior leaders are encouraged to proactively seek their assistance if required. The study found that those who are yet to establish a relationship with their coordinators, for example individuals who may be new in post or who are unaware of the support available, were unlikely to receive support. This highlights that either some senior leaders at GFE colleges are not engaging with available Prevent support or the open-door system is not well known or understood. Thus, to improve the likelihood of accessing support, the open door message should be effectively communicated both internally within colleges during handover procedures and more widely across the FE sector.

Staff training

5. Senior leaders approached basic mandatory Prevent training for staff as a 'tick-box' exercise to evidence implementing the duty for Ofsted inspections.

- All senior leaders indicated Workshop to Raise the Awareness of Prevent (WRAP)[5] training was mandatory for all staff, but there was a focus on evidencing the number of staff who had completed the training rather than monitoring their awareness and understanding of the duty and associated capabilities to enact the duty. It was presumed by senior leaders across the majority of colleges that by completing training, staff would be fully equipped to comply with the Prevent duty. However, although all teachers understood the duty and their responsibilities, some teachers and support staff across some colleges indicated that the WRAP training did not increase their confidence in dealing with Prevent; in particular, confidence around having conversations with learners on sensitive issues.

---

[5] WRAP is a free specialist workshop designed by HM Government (Home Office) providing an overview of the Prevent strategy and individuals' role(s) in safeguarding vulnerable people.

6. While all types of training provided an overview of the Prevent duty and increased general awareness amongst staff, the majority preferred face-to-face delivery.

- All teachers and support staff across the 20 case study colleges felt that online training was less engaging than face-to-face methods and online training was typically viewed as a 'tick-box' exercise. Some teachers and support staff suggested that the online training was too generic and not relevant to their college's local context. Face-to-face training was preferred as it allowed staff to ask follow-up questions and gain clarity on issues, or provided support on Prevent related issues where they lacked confidence.

7. Whilst all staff were required to undertake mandatory training as part of enacting their Prevent duty, senior and safeguarding staff participated in more advanced training.

- The level of training undertaken varied within colleges, and was dependent on a number of factors such as: the seniority of job role, the amount of interaction that staff had with learners and, the likelihood of staff being involved in the Prevent reporting process or making a Prevent referral. Senior leaders and staff primarily responsible for safeguarding (such as those involved in the referral process) in all colleges tended more than other staff to undertake both the mandatory training as well as additional external training in dealing with Prevent and wider safeguarding concerns.

8. Mandatory training covered theoretical knowledge and information on reporting processes but lacked practical guidance on dealing with challenging circumstances and having conversations on sensitive issues.

- Some teachers reported that the mandatory training they received covered theoretical information on the Prevent duty and provided an overview of their colleges' reporting structures, but lacked practical guidance on dealing with Prevent issues in the classroom. Some teachers and support staff across some colleges said this was why they were less comfortable with unfamiliar situations leading to limited confidence in their abilities. Thus, for many teachers further training and resources on how to effectively embed Prevent into their lesson plans and guidance or information on having conversations with learners on sensitive issues would be key to increasing confidence to address issues surrounding extremism and radicalisation.

9. Ensuring agency staff, subcontractors and partners[6] received training in the Prevent duty presented a challenge for senior leaders.

- All GFE colleges ensured that all permanent staff were provided with mandatory Prevent training. However, delivering training to agency staff presented difficulties for some colleges. This was because many agency teaching staff were paid only for teaching hours and thus did not have the time or enthusiasm to engage with Prevent training. Subcontractors and partners did not have a legal requirement to enact the Prevent duty and senior leaders found it difficult to communicate their Prevent responsibilities to subcontractors and partners and/or how fulfilling these responsibilities could affect their relationship with the partner.

Educating learners

10. Education packages[7] had positive impacts on learners' ability to identify, and willingness to report, safeguarding issues but the majority of learners had a limited understanding of radicalisation and extremism concepts.

- The majority of learners across most GFE colleges were both confident with the Prevent reporting system within their colleges, and recognised that the Prevent duty is primarily concerned with their safety. However, the majority of learners typically said they did not feel engaged during their tutorials or induction where Prevent was addressed. They also paid little attention to Prevent posters because Prevent issues were not a commonplace experience for most. Nevertheless, for the majority of teachers, the priority was to ensure learners knew enough to keep themselves safe and reported on the whole that learner awareness was at a level required for safeguarding.

11. Staff were encouraged to embed Prevent into lessons. However, the extent to which this occurred and the efficacy of embedding Prevent differed by subject.

---

[6] Agency staff are those academic and non-academic staff who are employed on a contract term through a recruitment agency who usually hold responsibility of communication and overseeing their employment. FE colleges can have subcontractors and partners such as training providers who are appointed to deliver other course offers.

[7] All colleges' education packages for learners consisted of addressing Prevent through tutorials that generally used standardised materials which were either authored centrally or adapted from materials created by external bodies; and/or allowed departmental or teaching staff to develop and integrate Prevent and British values into their lessons and/or the subject curriculum.

- The majority of staff across most GFE colleges reported that embedding Prevent into the curriculum was more effective where the subject lent itself to the topic. For example, learners studying health and social care, public services or politics were more likely to cover Prevent-relevant topics than learners studying mathematics or physics. Learners of these subjects tended to be more knowledgeable of Prevent and the different types of extremist behaviour. They usually had a better-developed understanding of Prevent issues and were able to discuss concepts more eloquently than other learners.

12. Delivering consistent messages about Prevent to staff and learners presented a challenge in larger colleges.

- Many of the larger GFE colleges[8] relied on a set of common materials which tutors and departments could tailor for their learners rather than using a set tutorial programme[9] because of difficulties in managing a centralised approach across different sites. The tailoring of materials reportedly led to inconsistent pedagogical approaches to teaching Prevent and variance in the quality of delivery. This made it harder for larger colleges to control messaging and quality of delivery because senior leaders were more reliant on staff for effective dissemination and delivery of messaging.

Reporting Processes

14. All staff were confident about the processes for reporting Prevent issues as existing safeguarding procedures were utilised.

- All types of staff (teachers and support staff) reported that they were confident with the reporting structure because it was both familiar and normal practice to discuss issues with other members of staff in safeguarding teams. As a result, all staff across all colleges reported that no changes to reporting structures were necessary.

15. Prevent referrals constituted a very small proportion of the safeguarding issues dealt with by all GFE colleges, but were dealt with as a matter of urgency by both safeguarding teams and Channel[10] representatives.

---

[8] Larger colleges are those who had multiple sites and a larger student population comparatively to other colleges that were involved in the study.
[9] A set tutorial programme is a general programme that is delivered to all learners.
[10] The Channel programme which is led by the police and local authorities provides a way to refer individuals who are at risk of being drawn into terrorism into support.

- For all colleges, directors and/or safeguarding leads were responsible for making contact with Channel representatives in the local authority. The majority of senior leaders stressed that Prevent enquiries were treated as urgent by both the college staff and Channel. Although Prevent referrals were low in numbers, occurrences were viewed as high risk, resulting in them being dealt with instantly.

16. Staff who do not have regular contact with learners lack confidence in making Prevent referral decisions and report all concerns which could be burdensome for safeguarding teams.

- Some senior leaders have indicated that staff who do not have regular contact with learner's e.g. administrative staff, lack confidence in making decisions about whether Prevent related concerns require escalating through internal reporting structures. As a result, these types of staff have a tendency to report all worries which can be both challenging and burdensome for safeguarding staff to deal with. While all senior leaders agreed that all college staff have a safeguarding responsibility, additional support, guidance and training such as learning from other teachers' experiences would help non-teaching staff improve their confidence and understanding of Prevent.

17. IT security to safeguard learners has generally worked well. However, monitoring social media use and educating learners about social media presented a challenge.

- All GFE colleges had a series of automated systems in place to remotely monitor network activity which were reported as working well since these systems alerted any concerns directly to IT support staff. However, many colleges highlighted that monitoring social media (accessing specific pages on social media platforms) presents a challenge because it cannot be remotely supported or controlled on college sites and thus learners are relied upon to report concerns. Social media was also less likely to be covered in lessons compared to Prevent issues because of the social media landscape constantly changing, some teachers reported that they felt less able to keep up to date with new platforms. Overall for these teachers, they felt their knowledge (and interest in) social media was less than many learners. This illustrates challenges in monitoring social media use and educating learners about the safe use of social media platforms.

Impact of implementing the Prevent duty for Senior Leaders

18. Prevent duties took time and resources to implement. Senior leaders would prefer a level of autonomy in deciding safeguarding priorities for their learners.

- The resources put into Prevent were viewed by some senior leaders as disproportionate compared with those available for other areas of safeguarding e.g. grooming. In particular, senior leaders from two colleges were concerned that issues that affect many more learners than Prevent in their colleges (mental health, wellbeing, learner hardship, and other criminal activity etc.) were under-resourced by comparison. A few staff also drew a conclusion about the level of funding based on the quick response times from the local authority, Channel and the police associated with referrals, inferring that the speed of response (within hours) implied significant resource underpinning the policy. Therefore, these senior leaders felt pressure to invest time and money in addressing Prevent as it is a legal duty and assessed during Ofsted inspections. However, these senior leaders suggested removing such pressure would allow them to allocate resources to pertinent safeguarding issues within their college contexts which would in return be more impactful for their learners.

Conclusions

Overall, the implementation of the Prevent duty in GFE colleges has resulted in extra measures being enforced to ensure learners are kept safe within and outside of colleges. Despite the apparent lack of theoretical understanding of extremism or radicalisation amongst learners, their capacity to identify issues and willingness to report concerns to staff ensures Prevent issues can be investigated and dealt with appropriately. However, certain barriers (such as lack of confidence, low learner engagement and/or managing training of agency staff) exist in implementing the duty effectively. All staff emphasised that they take safeguarding extremely seriously and strive to comply with their Prevent duties.

1 Introduction

CFE research were commissioned by the Department for Education (DfE) to explore how general further education (FE) colleges (GFE) have approached and responded to Prevent requirements. The research will help DfE to develop its understanding of whether the FE sector has the support, training and resources it needs to implement Prevent.

1.1 Background of the study

Understanding the Policy Context

In July 2015, a legal duty was implemented placing a statutory duty on schools, higher education (HE) institutions, and further education (FE) providers to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism' (Counter Terrorism and Security Act, 2015)[11]. This was a key development of Prevent, one of four strands of the government's overall counter-terrorism strategy, CONTEST[12], which was updated in June 2018.

As part of the government's commitment to support providers and their staff across the FE sector, a duty guidance for the FE sector (2015[13]) was published. The guidance makes clear the important role of FE providers (including sixth form colleges and independent training providers) in stopping extremists from radicalising learners and in supporting vulnerable learners at greater risk of extremist influences. It is also a condition of funding that all FE providers comply with relevant legislation and statutory responsibilities related to the delivery of education and safeguarding of learners.

Accordingly, the Prevent duty guidance outlines how FE providers are expected to comply with Prevent as a legal obligation and as a requirement of Ofsted's Common Inspection Framework. The duty guidance as applied to GFE colleges concerns the practices, activities and policies that a college has in place to enact its duties under four general themes: risk assessment (to measure vulnerability), working in partnership, staff training, and IT policies. The research findings address these areas in-depth and are reported in the subsequent chapters.

The Channel programme sits under the 'working in partnership' aspect of Prevent duty guidance for FE providers. The programme, which is led by the Police and local

---

[11] HM Government (2015) Counter-Terrorism and Security Act: Document collection.
[12] HM Government (2018) CONTEST: The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering Terrorism. HM Government. London. Report CM 9608.
[13] HM Government. (no date) Prevent Duty Guidance: for further education institutions in England & Wales.

authorities, is voluntary and uses a multi-agency approach to protect vulnerable people by:

- identifying individuals vulnerable to radicalisation;

- assessing the nature and extent of the vulnerability; and,

- developing the most appropriate support plan for the individuals concerned.

For FE providers, the Channel programme provides a way to refer individuals who are at risk of being drawn into terrorism into support. For example, this may include education or employment assistance, health support or ideological mentoring. Approximately six in ten of those receiving Channel support in 2016/17 were aged 20 or younger and 82% were male.

Prevent covers all forms of radicalisation that could draw people into terrorism[14]. The Home Office identifies priority areas based on an unpublished risk assessment method. The Local Authorities (LA) classed as priority areas receive funding to support Prevent activity (OSCT, 2015[15]). The new CONTEST[16] identifies the most significant current threat as being posed by UK residents influenced by non-UK groups including Daesh and Al-Qaida organisations. However, the other main ideological threat the strategy prioritises is that posed by extreme right-wing and neo-Nazi groups.

The role of Ofsted

The Ofsted inspection system includes assessment criteria connected to Prevent (Ofsted, 2018[17]).

1. The Ofsted grade category for effectiveness of leadership and management assesses: "the effectiveness of safeguarding practice, including the prevention of radicalisation of learners and compliance with the 'Prevent' duty" (Ofsted 2018, pg. 38).
2. Two measures are relevant within the personal development, behaviour and welfare category: "how well learners know how to protect themselves from the risks associated with radicalisation [.] [And] extremism…" […] [and] "the extent to which learners feel and are safe and have a good understanding of how they can raise concerns if they do not feel safe" (Ofsted 2018, pg.46).

---

[14] HM Government (2015) *Revised Prevent Duty Guidance: for England and Wales*. London.
[15] Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism (2105) Annex A – New Burden Assessment - analysis of the impact of the new Prevent Duty on Local Authorities.
[16] HM Government (2018) *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering Terrorism*. London.
[17] Ofsted (2018) *Further Education and Skills Inspection Handbook*. Ofsted. Manchester.

In 2016, Ofsted published a report showcasing an early snapshot of the first few months after the duty came into force in FE. The Ofsted report stated that the majority of providers had made good progress in implementing the Prevent duty, but a number were struggling and subsequently many FE colleges and skills providers were leaving their learners at risk of radicalisation and extremism[18]. Despite some development, Ofsted felt that some providers saw their Prevent duties as little more than a 'tick-box exercise' and did not regard it as an important part of their responsibilities towards learners. A key recommendation for government in the Ofsted report was to ensure Prevent duty advice is offered consistently to providers and the government should better promote the guidance that is available to FE providers.

In response, since 2016, the DfE and the Home Office have developed tools and materials that both schools and GFE colleges can utilise to implement the Prevent duty. For instance, Educate Against Hate[19], an online service that provides practical advice, support and resources to protect FE learners from extremism and radicalisation. Following consultation with a range of individuals and organisations, the Home Office have also produced e-learning training[20] on Prevent which offers an introduction to the duty and explains how it aims to safeguard vulnerable people from being radicalised into supporting terrorism or becoming terrorists themselves. Additionally the Education and Training Foundation (ETF)[21] have produced a website (Prevent for FE and training[22]) which has training modules for staff.

Evidence on the role of Prevent in Further Education

While Prevent became a statutory duty for the FE sector in 2015, discussions around the role FE plays in strengthening communities against extremism of all persuasions were occurring in government much earlier. In the foreword of a report (2009) published by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS)[23], David Lammy[24] MP noted the responsibility FE colleges have to safeguard democratic and academic freedoms, but also to ensure these freedoms are not exploited for violent ends.

Wider evidence on how Prevent is playing out within FE is limited. However, findings from three key reports on Prevent in FE resonate with the findings of this study and are

---

[18] HM Government. (no date) Prevent Duty Guidance: for further education institutions in England & Wales.
[19] HM Government (2018) *Education Against Hate*
[20] HM Government (2018) *Prevent e-learning*
[21] The ETF, established in 2013, is the government based, sector-owned national support body for the FE and training sector and provides training and resources on Prevent.
[22] Prevent and FE training Weblink
[23] DIUS (2009) The Role of Further Education Colleges in Preventing Violent Extremism: Next Steps. Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills. London.
[24] Minister of State for Higher Education and Intellectual Property

discussed in the conclusion. Busher et al (2017)[25] noted that Prevent is typically implemented by schools and colleges as a part of wider safeguarding duties, which can facilitate explaining the purpose of Prevent to staff and learners. Safeguarding in general, which includes Prevent, is a key element of the Association of Teachers and Leaders[26] (ATL) FE guidance (2015). Similarly this study also found that the implementation of Prevent was embedded in safeguarding policies and reporting systems. The ATL guidance also indicates the importance of risk assessments, and the 20 GFE colleges that took part in this study incorporated risk assessments when developing their policy and strategy documents. Ofsted (2016) found that GFE colleges were the most successful FE institution at implementing Prevent and often form strong external partnerships with local authorities and the ETF. Correspondingly, this study found that many colleges sought support from local authorities, FE/HE prevent coordinators and made use of ETF training materials.

Overall, this study improves the existing evidence base. This is the first FE study that has used empirical qualitative data collection i.e. face-to-face interviews with learners as opposed to Busher et al's (2017) approach of interviewing educationalists only. Of these, Busher et al's (2017) interviews were conducted in four FE colleges in London and West Yorkshire; selected on the basis of featuring in national debates about Prevent and where members of the research team had previously worked. However, this study included a diverse sample inclusive of priority, adjacent and non-priority areas across England to provide a range of views in differing localities. Additionally, while the aforementioned studies have interviewed a selection of leaders from FE providers, the scale of the qualitative approach for this study is greater. For instance, this study interviewed more than 35 senior leaders and over 80 other members of staff, while studies such as Busher et al (2017) interviewed 14 senior leaders (across schools and FE colleges). As such, this study provides a greater range of views.

1.2 Aims and Objectives of the Research

Research was required to strengthen the evidence base on how GFE college staff have understood, implemented and experienced the statutory duty to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism', and the impact on learners [27].

In particular, the research aimed to investigate the following elements:

---

[25] Busher et al (2017) What the Prevent duty means for schools and colleges in England: An analysis of educationalists' experiences, University of Huddersfield.
[26] ATL is a trade union
[27] Government counter-terrorism and security bill

- Perceptions of the Prevent duty and other related policy (e.g. the promotion of fundamental British values) among GFE college leaders, teachers, support staff and learners;

- College leaders' and teachers' understanding of how Prevent is implemented and embedded in GFE colleges; and,

- The perceptions of the impact of the policy on learners among all staff types and learners.

This study forms part of ongoing work to improve the evidence base on the implementation of Prevent in FE; GFE colleges will help government understand the impact of their support and interventions to date; and, identify key challenges and areas that may require further intervention.

1.3 Research questions

The research questions that underpin this study and that are subsequently addressed in this report are:

- What are the perceptions within GFE colleges of different aspects of Prevent/ Counter-Extremism (CE) policy and why?

- What are the perceptions within GFE colleges of how Prevent/CE policy is embedded within FE college policy and how it plays out in practice?

- What is the perceived impact of Prevent/CE policy on FE learners in GFE colleges?

- What is the perceived additional support GFE colleges require to implement the Prevent duty?

1.4 Methodology

The methodology for this study was designed in partnership with DfE and a steering group made up of Prevent and counter-extremism policy specialists and representatives from the DfE and the Home Office. The core of the method was a day-long fieldwork visit to each of the twenty participating GFE colleges in England. With reference to Table 1, the key sample characteristics of the participating colleges are:

- The GFE college's geographical location incorporating those based in Home Office Priority LA or UA areas; those based in LAs/UAs adjacent to a Priority Area; and, those situated elsewhere[28].

- The most recent Ofsted rating of the GFE college: outstanding, good, satisfactory or inadequate. A spread of colleges was sought based on this rating.

- A mix of GFE colleges based on two other sociodemographic criteria: rurality and the size of the college[29].

The sampling for the study was purposive. This means GFE colleges were sought to cover potential eventualities and contexts relevant to Prevent.

---

[28] These areas were situated in neither priority nor adjacent to a priority area.
[29] In which size is a measure of the number of students enrolled and multiple sites.

Table 1 Profile of participating colleges

Sampling criteria	Colleges
Priority Areas	
In a Home Office Priority Area	9
Adjacent to a Home Office Priority Area	4
Other Local / Unitary Authority	7
Ofsted Rating	
Outstanding / Good	13 *(of which 5 were PA, 2 Adjacent, and 5 Other)*
Requires improvement	7 *(of which 4 were PA, 1 Adjacent and 2 other)*
Other criteria	
Conurbation	9 *(of which 7 were PA, 1 Adjacent and 1 other)*
Cities and towns	11 *(of which 2 were PA, 3 Adjacent and 6 other)*

CFE recruited GFE colleges to take part in the study by telephone after an initial invitation email from DfE was sent to 131 colleges that were identified using Edubase and applying the aforementioned sampling characteristics. Follow-up communication was made by CFE with GFE colleges who sent CFE an e-mail agreeing to participate in the research. Each college visit included:

- A combination of face-to-face paired or one-to-one interview/s with two senior leaders lasting approximately 60 minutes to understand the college's strategic approach to enacting the Prevent duty, experiences of implementing the duty, and the nature and number of referrals per year;

- Approximately two small focus groups (consisting of 4-5 teaching and support staff and lasting 45 minutes) to explore in detail their perceptions of Prevent responsibilities, training and education and the impact the duty has had on them and learners; and,

- Six to eight interviews, in pairs or individually with learners (lasting 30-45 minutes) to discuss in detail specific activities, practices and delivery arrangements, and any impacts of these on learners.

In addition, seven interviews with representatives from local authority and/or regional FE/HE Prevent co-ordinators were also completed by telephone. These took place during or after the fieldwork visits to understand the contexts in which colleges operate and lasted between 45-60 minutes.

1.5   Limitations of the findings

The sampling approach aimed to compare GFE colleges based on criteria that may have some bearing on implementing Prevent i.e. Ofsted ratings. However, no college with an "inadequate" Ofsted rating was included in the study. CFE Research did not pursue colleges with a rating of 'inadequate' beyond the initial invitation email because of the pressures such providers are often under.

The study was qualitative in nature and sought to identify and explore a range of issues from the perspectives of the participants (senior leaders, teachers, support staff and learners) from the 20 case study GFE colleges; the report makes no attempt to quantify findings and findings cannot be generalised beyond the sample. However, qualitative transferability can apply i.e. relating to Bassey's (1998) concept of 'fuzzy generalisations' where findings demonstrate instances of a broader set of recognisable features that have emerged in other research on Prevent in FE specifically and in education generally. For instance, as discussed earlier and evidenced in the report, while the evidence base in this area is scant the findings in this study chime with findings in three other reports: Busher et al (2017), ATL guidance (2015) and Ofsted (2016). So, while the sample size was limited, the findings provide insight into and a coverage of the breadth and depth of issues involved, which constitutes an important contribution to the developing evidence-base around Prevent in GFE colleges.

One of the key findings presented in the report is the connection that all participating colleges made between Prevent and general safeguarding policies and processes. Therefore, the authors note that some of the practices described in the report are not specific to Prevent duties.

1.6   Report structure

The findings of this study broadly cover the process of implementing the Prevent duty in GFE colleges. First, there will be an overview of how GFE colleges designed policies that govern their approach to enacting Prevent duties. The report subsequently describes any staff training or development activity, the design of training, and views on effectiveness and impact of training. Thereafter, an exploration of the methods used to educate learners about issues associated with Prevent, radicalisation and extremism. Following

this, aspects of the reporting process via Channel are discussed. Finally, there will be a consideration of the impacts enacting the Prevent duty in GFE colleges has had on learners, teachers, support staff and senior leaders. The report concludes by summarising the key findings in relation to the study's objectives.

2 Formalising the Prevent duty: policies and documents

To comply with the Prevent duty, the statutory guidance mandates GFE colleges to have policies, strategy documents and procedures in place (i.e. risk assessments, action plans and external speakers and events). These policies are designed to evidence procedures that GFE colleges are utilising to address the Prevent duty and the wellbeing of their learners. This chapter explores attitudes towards policy development and strategic responses to the duty from the perspective(s) of senior leaders. This is followed by an overview of the approaches GFE colleges took to develop policies and subsequently explores teachers' and support staffs' attitudes towards the implementation of Prevent strategies. Within each of these sections the main themes emerging from the data are discussed and where appropriate commonalities and differences between colleges are considered.

2.1 Attitudes towards policy development

2.1.1 Prevent and safeguarding

All senior leaders, indicated that the Prevent duty is viewed as part of their wider approach to safeguarding because they relate Prevent to the key priority of protecting and keeping learners safe (recognising both education and reporting processes as contributing to safeguarding).

> "We see it as part of our safeguarding process, and it's about protecting our learners, partly through having the right systems and processes and partly through education and training. That's at the core of both policies, so we try not to differentiate too much."

(Senior leader, other area, conurbation)

There were no differences in the attitudes of senior leaders towards developing Prevent procedures among GFE colleges that were located in priority areas compared to those that were not. Despite GFE colleges varying in size, locality (Home Office areas i.e. priority/non-priority and urban/rural) and learner demographic profiles, all senior leaders across all participating colleges reported that addressing the Prevent duty was a legal obligation that was fundamentally based on protecting and keeping learners safe.

> "It's a duty that is given to colleges in order to ensure that the Prevent element of the counter terrorism strategy is in practice within our environments, so that we are working proactively with young people and adults to ensure that they know how to identify and protect themselves from radicalisation and extremism. They

feel they are in a safe environment to discuss any issues of concern that they know how to spot the signs and where to go for support."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

Accordingly, Prevent strategies were typically embedded into existing safeguarding policies and procedures. While all senior leaders across all GFE colleges indicated the overlap of Prevent and safeguarding as the principal reason for integrating Prevent into safeguarding policies, some senior leaders from some GFE colleges specified three further key motivations for this approach. Firstly, extending existing safeguarding procedures to include Prevent enabled the process to be done with relative ease since colleges were building upon existing policies. Secondly, utilising established and tested safeguarding procedures provided these senior leaders with confidence that their approach to Prevent would be successful.

"We've got an established safeguarding policy and we've added the Prevent agenda into that. The reason we put it into safeguarding is because we've got well established procedures there."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

Lastly, there was a collective view that since extremism and other issues such as grooming and sexual exploitation were viewed as part of safeguarding, they should be approached in a similar manner in terms of reporting procedures and processes. One senior leader suggested it would be confusing for staff to have individual procedures for different circumstances. It was assumed that by using well-known procedures there was a greater likelihood that staff within colleges would 'get it right' and meet the overarching duty of safeguarding their learners.

"I believe that it is part of safeguarding our community. We wouldn't be saying, 'That's a safeguarding matter. You're talking about extremism here, we have to have a different approach to it.' [I]t's confusing to staff to say, 'respond to an extremist view in this way, but if someone says they're being sexually exploited or groomed, do this.' […] If we get it right we're safeguarding our community, so why would you try to separate it? That was the rationale."

(Senior leader, priority area, cities and towns)

Additionally, as demonstrated in the quote below, one senior leader reported that producing endless policies would be counterproductive since their staff were unlikely to read them due to busy schedules. Safeguarding is viewed as the overarching responsibility of staff and is taken seriously. Thus, by embedding

Prevent into an existing framework such as safeguarding, Prevent is approached as a priority.

> "Prevent sits under safeguarding, so we don't have a separate Prevent policy. You can proliferate policies as infinitum and nobody will read the damn things, so therefore what we want is a safeguarding policy which is our priority and underneath that sits Prevent."

(Senior leader, priority area, cities and towns)

The perception among the majority of senior leaders across all GFE colleges was that the requirement to prevent learners being drawn into extremism and terrorism has always existed as a safeguarding issue. However, the introduction of the duty forced a fundamental review of how to incorporate the published Prevent guidance[30] into existing policies. For example, as demonstrated in the quote below, one senior leader stated that pre-existing procedures and policies on behaviour, external speakers and IT safety were amended to specifically address safety procedures on radicalisation and extremism. By utilising existing safeguarding policies to include Prevent, all senior leaders reported Prevent policy development as a relatively straightforward and positive process.

> "[Prevent is] mostly wrapped up in the safeguarding policy. Obviously we've amended other policies to reference Prevent duties, so, things like our behaviour policy, we've got our IT social network policies, stuff around filtering and firewalls on IT, we've got a visiting speaker policy, a fundraising policy. Quite a lot of those things were in place before, it's just they've been amended to reflect the Prevent duty."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

2.1.2 Prevent and the college environment

The college environment and physical security is not part of Prevent. However, the majority of senior leaders, teachers and support staff from almost all GFE colleges viewed these issues and Prevent as part of the same package (e.g. lockdown procedure[31] and 'run, hide and tell' campaigns[32]). They were commonly described by teachers and senior leaders as approaches that evidence the implementation of the Prevent duty, since both focused on learner safety. There appeared to be key differences between colleges located in rural areas compared to those in predominantly urban

---

[30]Prevent Duty Guidance for Further Education

[31] A lockdown of college premises/buildings is an emergency procedure to secure and protect learners and all staff from immediate threat such as a violent intruder.

[32] The government launched it's 'Run, Hide, Tell' campaign in 2015 which provides guidance to the UK public on how to respond to attacks involving firearms and weapons.

environments. The security arrangements for GFE colleges in major cities were tighter. Several had experiences of intruders and/or perceived risks in communal areas e.g. theft incidents. Some GFE colleges also reported past bomb scares, had direct or near experience of extremist incidents. Although not a requirement under the Prevent duty, these GFE colleges were more likely to have implemented security changes e.g. turnstiles, indicating college security seemed to appropriately reflect the (perceived) general risks the colleges faced.

> "We have a Prevent strategy, we've got Prevent risk assessment, safeguarding policy incorporates actions to take if we have concerns about a learner. We have a lockdown procedure as well. […] If we have somebody that comes in and presents a threat, we can lock the college down, so people can lock their doors, they know the signal. People can keep themselves safe until we've sorted the situation out. In that respect, its part of that 'run, hide, tell' promotion."
>
> *(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)*

In contrast, one senior leader working in a smaller, rural GFE college chose not to introduce physical security measures such as turnstiles stressing that safety was also learners' responsibility. While, all senior leaders across all GFE colleges emphasised the role of learners in keeping safe i.e. wearing visible coloured lanyards, security was heavily invested in colleges where the perceived risk of intruders or other incidents was higher; typically in urban areas which are also more likely to be priority areas. A less intrusive approach was arguably more feasible in GFE colleges located in lower-risk, non-priority areas. Although differences in approaches to physical security exist in urban and rural areas and security measures are not a requirement of the Prevent duty, the majority of senior leaders and teachers from almost all GFE colleges viewed physical safety as part of complying with the Prevent duty.

> "I didn't want to do it I didn't want the college, the physical college, to become some kind of prison. It's a public building, at the end of the day. People come and go. We try to make it as open as possible and help young people understand they're responsible as well. So, if they see or hear something, it doesn't feel right etc., then they know what to do about that."
>
> *(Senior leader, other area, conurbation)*

2.2 Approaches towards policy development

There appeared to be no relationship between the approach taken by senior leaders in developing Prevent policies and specific Ofsted ratings on the 'effectiveness of leadership and management' (that considers safeguarding practice, including compliance with the Prevent duty) within the 20 GFE colleges. However, there were slight variations

in approaches to policy development according to the size of colleges[33]. The majority of senior leaders from almost all of the smaller GFE colleges indicated that Prevent policies were developed internally by the safeguarding lead (or equivalent). These senior members of staff were perceived to be the most appropriate to undertake the task since they have had the greatest level of training and experience in safeguarding and have the most exposure to wider networks by attending board meetings (e.g. local safeguarding children board, multi-agency Prevent groups and safeguarding committees etc.).

In larger GFE colleges, which includes colleges with two or more sites, Prevent policies were developed through working-groups. All senior leaders from GFE colleges that housed larger learner populations across multi-sites suggested these groups brought together members from the senior leadership team, safeguarding officers, well-being staff, governors and learner representatives from the various sites. The value of bringing together experiences from different sites ensured strategies were appropriate for all localities (e.g. some sites were located in town centres whilst others were located on outskirts of towns).

One senior leader from a large priority area GFE college reported a distinctive example of policy development compared to the other participating colleges. To ensure individual policies (e.g. IT risk assessments) were well established and covered all necessary components, this college had smaller working-groups that invited staff who were IT professionals or those that had relevant expertise to provide support and feedback on policies.

> "There was a team approach to developing the Prevent policies, so we are often asked to comment on them before they get approved. We would have had small meetings around aspects of them to make sure we've covered as much as possible within that policy. That would have been a specific team."

> *(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)*

The majority of senior leaders across almost all GFE colleges sought external support to either develop or review their policies, action plans and procedures. For the majority, this support came from local authorities or regional FE/HE Prevent coordinators. Those that had support from Prevent coordinators or local authorities were very positive about their experience, suggesting the guidance was valuable and the support has been outstanding.

> "We developed them with colleagues, so, like, the FE/HE Prevent lead provided guidance, we drafted it, it went through our internal committee structures and then

---

[33] In which size is a measure of the number of students enrolled.

I asked for approval, not approval, ratification maybe and some comments […] from Channel."

(Senior leader, priority area, cities and towns)

Some senior leaders from larger, inner city GFE colleges had input from a range of external stakeholders. Representatives from these colleges sit on local Prevent structures, 'Gold', 'Silver' and 'Bronze' multiagency coordination groups[34] (local authority, police, Channel, FE representatives and schools). Gold groups provide strategic direction with senior representation whilst silver and bronze are for implementation and sharing mechanisms that are in place. Those senior leaders who have had this opportunity to partake in multiagency coordination groups, largely reflect on it as having been beneficial as a wider spectrum of opinions were gained. The following case study (A) highlights, one college that proactively sought various support from different avenues and reported that working collaboratively with stakeholders, schools and GFE colleges strengthened their response to the Prevent duty.

---

[34] As part of the counter-terrorism strategy (CONTEST), of which Prevent is one of the four elements, local authority task groups were set up to address and implement the strategy. Gold provides senior representation and strategic guidance whilst silver and bronze were for sharing practice.

Case Study A

One GFE college in a Priority area benefitted from working collaboratively with stakeholders by drawing on the expertise of various groups and individuals to assist with the development of strategy documents. The college engaged with stakeholders through the following formal and informal mechanisms:

1. They had representatives on the Prevent Gold, Silver and Bronze groups. These groups are made up of individuals from local authority, police, Channel, FE and primary and secondary schools.

2. They had an established relationship with their community support officer from the police.

3. They had sought guidance from external organisations such as the Education Training Foundation (ETF).

As well as working collaboratively to develop the colleges' Prevent action plan, the three approaches provided the GFE college with advice on how to embed their policies into their existing strategies, offered objective analysis to identify weaknesses and gave advice on how to deal with concerns, in particular what concerns should be referred to Channel. Thus, drawing on the expertise of organisations who also deal with Prevent issues has enabled this GFE college to strengthen their response to the Prevent duty.

> "We've taken advice from our Prevent partners as well. So, I asked them to look at IT policies, for example, and they've come up with some actions for us. I haven't just written them in isolation. So, all of the policies that I do, I'll tend to write them. We go through them as a team, and then I'll get external advice on them, so our Prevent partners look through them all."
>
> *(Senior leader)*

Although, sharing good practice was common among these strategic groups (Gold, Silver and Bronze Prevent groups), some senior leaders reported it was not the case for their colleges. For example, one senior leader suggested competition between FE colleges in the local area resulted in them working in isolation. Consequently, some senior leaders noted a need for work to be done that challenges and remoulds perceptions and presuppositions concerning competition (often discussed within the context of Ofsted ratings) which may decrease incidences of sharing practice within the sector. As demonstrated below, one senior leader recognised that by sharing materials with schools and amongst GFE colleges, the duty can be enacted more proficiently.

"We work closely with the schools in [the area] and safeguarding and Prevent are things that head teachers or college principals have in common and we work closely with them. An example, I was very impressed with a sixth form college in [area]. It had produced a British values video. I thought, 'That's perfect, so let's cut and paste it.' We produced that for ourselves, but sent it out around the area. That was well received."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

One senior leader sought support materials on the internet; accessing statutory guidance on keeping children safe in education. This supports the association of Prevent with safeguarding evidenced in this report.

"A lot of it was done in-house, but in a methodical way. So by having the Prevent guidance on the desktop at the same time as the keeping children safe in education. At the time I was involved in writing that policy, there was a lot of advice coming through the Prevent for FE and education website."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

Only two senior leaders from different GFE colleges stated that they sought no support from external stakeholders, since the duty was relatively new they assumed there was not very much information available at the time of developing their policies or that external agencies (e.g. FE/HE regional Prevent coordinators) were stretched. For some GFE colleges, support was not available at the time they were developing their policies since some regions did not have a coordinator in post in 2015. However, interviews with FE/HE regional Prevent coordinators indicated that as they cover large areas that span over numerous colleges, typically all FE/HE regional Prevent coordinators use an 'open-door' system where senior leaders are encouraged to be proactive in seeking their assistance if required. Therefore, those college leaders who are yet to establish a relationship with their coordinators, for example individuals who may be new in post or are unaware of the support available, may be unlikely to receive guidance. This highlights that either senior leaders at GFE colleges are not engaging with available Prevent support due to preconceptions of resources being stretched or due to the open-door system. Thus, to improve the likelihood of senior leaders accessing support, the message of an open door system might need to be communicated more clearly, widely and often than is currently the case.

"FE/HE coordinators are often relied upon as a source of guidance or contact, so we do all sorts of things such as providing institutions with support on strategic guidance, assisting them with their risk assessment, developing their Prevent action plans and assisting them on whether to make a referral or not."

(FE/HE coordinator)

2.2.1 Senior Leader and Staff Attitudes

All senior leaders said that their Prevent policy documents were designed to provide clear guidance on the colleges' priorities in relation to the Prevent duty, British values and set out the approach to reviewing and monitoring action plans if required.

Only one senior leader stated that their policies and procedures were exclusively for use by governors who have ultimate responsibility for statutory requirements being fulfilled. The strategies and policies were provided as written evidence to the governors of the work the college was undertaking to meet their duty.

> "It's about accountability of governors. They're ultimately responsible for making sure that we, as colleges, are adherent to statutory requirements. The policy almost helps them, provides them with that information."
>
> *(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)*

Additionally, the majority of senior leaders indicated that policy documents provided all types of staff with a guide of what was essential in implementing the duty. For example, one senior leader emphasised that their policies were utilised as a strategic framework in setting out the day-to-day activities and have encouraged staff to have difficult conversations with learners; working towards normalising such topics.

> "I think it gives us a framework on which to work. It's that strategic framework. It's about how we take what's in there and get it down to staff on the frontline, and learners themselves. It's about getting it to the frontline as much as we can, and working with learners and staff around some of the issues. It's made us talk about some of the things that people might not have found so easy to talk about previously. It's given a structure for some difficult conversations with learner groups."
>
> *(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)*

While the majority of senior leaders felt the policy documents they had developed were utilised as guides for their staff and thus helpful; the majority of staff (teachers and support staff) did not report this. Although all staff understood the Prevent duty and their responsibility to safeguard, the majority of teachers and support staff across almost all GFE colleges felt that as part of their role they did not need to have in-depth knowledge of the wider action plans senior leaders at their college were developing. For these teachers and support staff it was crucial to have the practical knowledge of the referral process that directly enables them to respond to issues. Therefore, while colleges' strategy documents were readily available to teaching and support staff on systems such as Moodle and SharePoint, they were generally accessed only during Prevent / safeguarding training. It was presumed among the majority of teachers and support staff that the training they received and their line managers would provide them with essential

information and that it was not deemed necessary for them to continually review or refresh their knowledge of their colleges' Prevent policy and strategy documents.

> "I get monthly emails, because I'm Safeguarding Officer. We get termly updates as well on where the country is in regards to Prevent. There's lots of information in there. Yes, an overload of information. If I've got time, I will read it. I don't prioritise it, because if it was something that I needed to know, my manager would just tell me."
>
> *(Staff, priority area, conurbation)*

Therefore, while many senior leaders reported that their strategy documents served a practical role that provided staff with guidance on their approach of implementing the duty, staff did not support this, illustrating a disconnect between the two groups. While all teachers and support staff had an in-depth understanding of the Prevent duty and policy generally, many teachers across the majority of GFE colleges suggested they were too busy to read their colleges' strategy documents. These documents were also deemed as irrelevant since staff emphasised the importance of having practical knowledge on reporting and dealing with issues. The lack of teachers and support staff representation in policy working-groups could contribute to the disconnect between senior leaders and their staff on the issue of strategy and policy documents.

2.3   Chapter Summary

To summarise, all senior leaders, teachers and support staff viewed the Prevent duty as part of safeguarding and accordingly, Prevent policies were embedded in wider safeguarding procedures. On the whole, approaches to policy and strategy development were similar across all GFE colleges with no differences among colleges that were situated in priority/non-priority areas. While senior leaders felt strategies were utilised as frameworks that outlined the activities staff should undertake, teachers and support staff found them irrelevant for their role. Rather, teachers and support staff emphasised that to enact the duty it was vital they had practical knowledge such as knowledge of reporting processes; which typically training and line managers provided.

Once policies, action plans and procedures were in place, all GFE colleges ensured their staff were competent in meeting the duty by providing training.

3   Preparing to enact the duty: staff training

As a requirement of the statutory guidance, all appropriate staff[35] are required to undertake training. This chapter considers the nature of training in terms of its format and content. It also explores the impact training has had on staff (mostly teachers, but also some support staff), by providing an overview of staff perceptions and attitudes towards training.

3.1   Training format and delivery

All senior leaders, teachers and support staff stated that training was typically conducted either online or face-to-face, with some GFE colleges providing a combination of the two. Those working in larger colleges tended to receive online training more than those working in colleges with a smaller learner population, primarily due to high rates of staff turnover. As staff were commonly required to undertake Prevent training as part of their induction, online training was easier to administer because new staff could complete the training in their own time. Additionally, online training was more practical to arrange for staff that work across several sites.

There were large variations between senior leaders and staff views on preferential training formats and subsequently their effectiveness in providing all staff with the necessary skills to feel confident in enacting the duty. The majority of senior leaders that offered online training suggested they were relatively confident that teachers and support staff preferred online training as it allowed them to complete it at a time that was convenient for them, subsequently having little impact on their teaching responsibilities or timetabling.

However, a common view among staff (teachers and support staff) across these colleges was that online training was not engaging and typically viewed as a 'tick-box' exercise; face-to-face training was preferred as it allowed staff to ask follow-up questions and gain clarity on issues that were either unclear or that they lacked confidence in dealing with (further discussed on pg. 37). For example, as illustrated in the quote below one teacher emphasised their concern (that was widely shared) about having a lack of confidence to deal with Prevent issues. However, face-to-face training helped the teacher to identify Prevent as a safeguarding issue which made them realise that there were no additional responsibilities and they had been fulfilling the duty prior to 2015.

---

[35] These staff members tended to be those who had a learner facing role i.e. administrative, teaching and support staff.

> "We had some training by the former safeguarding manager, and she presented [Prevent] as a safeguarding issue. That's when it clicked for me. It's an extension of safeguarding, its vulnerable young people that are going through difficulties and getting drawn into or groomed into radical groups of people. That gave me a different view on it."

(Staff, priority area, cities and towns)

All senior leaders indicated that teachers and support staff were required to attend refresher sessions as part of their Prevent training. The frequency of these sessions varied between different colleges. Whilst the majority of colleges delivered the refresher sessions annually, a minority indicated that staff were required to do refresher training every two to three years. There appeared to be no relationship between frequency of training with other factors such as college size, priority/non-priority or adjacent areas and Ofsted ratings.

Although the statutory guidance states appropriate staff members should have an understanding of the factors that make people vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism, all senior leaders emphasised that Prevent training was mandatory for all staff. The level of training undertaken varied within colleges, and was dependent on a number of different factors such as:

- The seniority of role in the college;

- The amount of interaction that staff had with learners; and,

- The assumed likelihood of staff being involved in the Prevent reporting process or making a Prevent referral.

Senior leaders and staff primarily responsible for safeguarding (such as those involved in the referral process) in all GFE colleges were more likely to undertake both the mandatory training as well as additional external training since these members of staff would be on the frontline when dealing with Prevent and wider safeguarding concerns.

> "There's a systematic training of staff, it's a compulsory online unit we all have to complete once a year. There's an enhanced version that safeguarding practitioners and senior managers will have to take as well."

(Senior leader, priority area, cities and towns)

3.2   Challenges in delivery: Agency staff

All GFE colleges ensured that all permanent staff were provided with mandatory Prevent training. However, delivering training to agency staff presented difficulties for some

colleges. This was because many agency teaching staff were paid only for teaching hours at several GFE colleges and thus did not have the time or enthusiasm to engage with Prevent training.

> "I think part of the problem is that the college hires a lot of agency workers, and a lot of agency workers can feel disconnected from the organisation, because they might be working somewhere else, or working at two different colleges, and they also don't maybe understand the importance of team meetings, if any."
>
> *(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)*

Senior leaders reported that safeguarding and Prevent training was mandatory for all staff, including agency staff. Some GFE colleges struggled to monitor whether agency staff had completed their mandatory online training. However, a few senior leaders in these GFE colleges indicated that they were currently sourcing different training methods which could be rolled out to agency staff more effectively.

Similar concerns were also faced with subcontractors and partners providing apprenticeships programmes as part of their course provision. Although partner organisations do not have a legal requirement to enact the Prevent duty, some GFE colleges' faced the challenge of engaging partner organisations in understanding the colleges' Prevent duty. Even though learners undertaking apprenticeship programmes spend the majority of their time off-site, GFE colleges still had a legal obligation to ensure that they were aware of the Prevent duty. Some GFE colleges undertook direct communication with employers in relation to Prevent and safeguarding, whilst others focused on educating learners so that they were aware of how to safeguard themselves. The majority of senior leaders from GFE colleges that work with employers suggested that more support was required to assist external organisations in understanding the colleges' Prevent duty.

> "That is a challenge because the duty places on us to work with our subcontractors and our partners. Their world is very removed from education anyway, and it is removed from the Prevent duty and the stipulations in education, but the commonality is the learner."
>
> *(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)*

3.3 Types of training courses for staff

Almost all of the senior leaders interviewed discussed the type of training courses their staff (teachers, safeguarding teams and support staff) were required to undertake as part of their Prevent duty. The majority of senior leaders across almost all GFE colleges

indicated that all staff (regardless of role or learner interaction) were required to undertake the Workshop to Raise the Awareness of Prevent 3 (WRAP 3) training[36].

Senior leaders and safeguarding teams typically undertook external WRAP training to become a qualified WRAP trainer, who went on to provide training for their staff members at the colleges. In addition, some senior leaders across most GFE colleges indicated that these senior management staff and safeguarding teams would also be responsible for providing further training to pastoral and tutorial staff using the Education Training Foundation's (ETF): Side-by-side facilitator guide and modules[37], who would then go on to deliver these to learners as part of their tutorial package.

A number of senior leaders spoke positively about the Prevent resources provided by the ETF. They were particularly impressed with the accessibility of the materials as they allowed staff to work through the materials at a time that was suitable for them and at their own pace.

> "We've seen a good online [training course], which is through the Education Training Foundation. You log on, it's free, you pick what your educational establishment is, what area you're from. It's online, and people work at their own pace. That's something a bit different for staff."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

Nonetheless, the duty has been in place for three years and training combined with refresher sessions were reported as becoming repetitive and tedious by some teachers and support staff across some GFE colleges. Some senior leaders from some GFE colleges emphasised that while ETF resources had been useful initially, they were exploring gaining alternative material from different sources to ensure training is engaging for their staff. One senior leader explicitly stated they were going to use new training materials that have been recently produced by the DfE. While, resources produced by ETF were commonly utilised across all case study colleges, 'Education Against Hate' was not used, perhaps since the materials are geared toward school leaders and staff.

> "We have used the ETF website and all their training modules, but we're just moving to [other training developed by the] Department of Education, which is not

---

[36] WRAP is a free specialist workshop designed by HM government (Home Office) providing an overview of the Prevent strategy and individuals role in safeguarding vulnerable people.
[37] ETF have developed modules for learners to raise awareness of the dangers of radicalisation and extremism to learners.

> Educate Against Hate, but there's a whole raft of new training materials which we're going to use this year to keep it fresh."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

Some GFE colleges also offered specialist training specifically for senior leaders and safeguarding staff. For example, members of the senior leadership team including the head of safeguarding at one GFE college were involved in undertaking both Project ARGUS[38] and Griffin training[39]. These initiatives were developed by the National Counter Terrorism Security Office (NaCTSO) with the aim of identifying measures to help organisations prevent, manage and recover from a terrorist incident. Although these training courses are not specifically related to Prevent, these senior leaders presumed having wider knowledge and understanding on counter-terrorism would be beneficial in safeguarding learners. As illustrated in the quote below, one senior leader stated further specialist training is offered directly only to staff who deal with safeguarding matters.

> "Everyone does online Prevent training, and they're regularly chased up. That's for all staff and governors. We do Project ARGUS and Griffin depending on the level. The specialist teams have more specialist training. There would be specific workshops for different groups of staff. We trained all the frontline staff."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

Although the majority of staff training was conducted in-house, some GFE colleges that had a positive working relationship with external stakeholders such as their local counter-terrorism unit or local authority had invited them to deliver their staff training. A number of senior leaders from these colleges indicated that they had sourced external support from their local police force and FE/HE Prevent coordinator to help contextualise and deliver their Prevent training for teachers and support staff. One senior leader commented on how their pre-existing relationship with external organisations was beneficial to the training delivered to their staff.

> "…[W]e've had the local area coordinator in a couple of times and he's done some training with staff, which was really well received."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

Senior leaders and safeguarding staff spoke positively about externally delivered courses that they were able to attend as part of their Prevent training as it provided them with confidence to disseminate learning amongst other staff members.

---

[38] Project Argus
[39] Griffin Training

3.4 Attitudes and perceptions towards training

There were clear differences in experiences between those staff that had only undertaken online training as opposed to those that were also able to participate in training delivered face-to-face. Some teachers and support staff suggested that the online training was too generic and not relevant to their college's local context. The majority of teachers and support staff across all GFE colleges believed that the online training exacerbated their concerns about being able to enact the duty as there was no formalised process in place to answer any of their follow-up questions. For example, a group of teachers indicated the area in which their GFE college was situated had issues with right-wing football radicalisation and they were keen to explore ways in which they could safeguard their learners. However, they have not found or received relevant training materials. A handful of teachers indicated that they felt training needed to be personalised to the college so staff could understand the context and appropriately safeguard their learners.

> "The training is very generic. A big problem we have [here] is radicalisation of football fans, 'Come and join our gang,' and it's a big issue. I don't know anything about that and if we are directing our learners or trying to safeguard them against radicalisation it should be against every potential."

(Staff, priority area, conurbation)

All of the teachers and support staff were more positive in GFE colleges where follow-up sessions were offered or training was delivered face-to-face rather than online training. They valued the opportunity to ask questions and interact with other staff members and they felt the sessions were more effective and engaging than the online training they had completed. One GFE college offered additional Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunities to staff who required more support once they had completed the online training which was highly valued.

> "I feel that there has always been lots of opportunities and lots of CPD sessions available to help and support my teaching. That's one thing the college is very good at is putting additional training on to support staff."

(Staff, other area, conurbation)

External training sessions were seen to be more engaging, especially when delivered by someone with lived experience of different forms of extremism. Staff from two different GFE colleges spoke about training delivered by a former Islamist and an Irish extremist[40]. Although Irish extremism is not typically discussed in these contexts, there was a

---

[40] Violent Republicanism as part of the Northern Irish troubles.

consensus amongst both sets of staff that the training was the most useful they had attended as it offered a real life perspective on Prevent and extremism. More widely, the majority of staff (teachers and support staff) also suggested that the training was most effective when the content covered different forms of radicalisations and did not just focus on Islamist extremism.

> "I did a piece of training about three years ago and the presenters, one was a former [Islamist] extremist and one had worked with far-right groups. That was really useful, especially talking to people who've had that experience."
>
> *(Staff, priority area, conurbation)*

Despite the variations in attitudes towards online, face-to-face and external training, the majority of teachers and support staff indicated that regardless of mode of delivery, the training raised their awareness of Prevent and increased their overall confidence in the reporting system. Many teachers highlighted that this information was not new and they were knowledgeable about identifying specific changes in learner behaviour, but the training brought these issues to the forefront and increased awareness. Some staff also emphasised that the training had a positive effect on their confidence in identifying behaviour change and making referrals.

> "You're just looking out [for specific signs or changes in behaviour], even if you overhear something, it's acting upon it. Even if you might see it as being something quite small, [it is] making sure you challenge the learners if they say something [contentious]. I think it's made [us staff] a bit more aware. The first thing [we're] told when they come in on their induction is, 'We all have a duty to look after each other."
>
> *(Staff, other area, cities and towns)*

However, given the sensitive nature of the topic area, some teachers still felt they lacked the confidence to approach Prevent in lessons and tutorials. There were concerns amongst these teachers around the usage of terms such as 'British values', 'radicalisation' and 'extremism' in lessons because they perceived such language may lead to controversial discussions in lessons that risked giving rise to stereotypical media portrayals. Also, as illustrated in the quote below, certain groups of people reportedly felt that the concept of 'British Values' was a government initiative that targets certain groups of people.

> "I think there was a lot of controversy over the British values aspect of it. Around the whole wording around British values and some staff were very anti that. Not the values bit, but tagging them up as British values. There was some cynicism that it's just another government thing, it's to target certain groups. I'd say that was a minority and obviously at first nobody had materials on Prevent so it was trying to develop materials that can be used in the classroom with learners."

Conversely, pastoral and tutorial teachers that had the ETF's Side-By-Side training spoke explicitly about how it enabled them to incorporate debates into their lessons on Prevent and have meaningful conversations with their learners. The training equipped these teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge to engage with learners on a wide range of safeguarding issues such as grooming and bullying, as well as Prevent.

Thus, many teachers across some GFE colleges suggested that further training and resources to address embedding Prevent into their lesson plans would be key in increasing confidence to address issues surrounding extremism and radicalisation.

> "I think there could be more in terms of direct resource in terms of, 'How do I actually embed Prevent into my lessons effectively'."

(Staff, other area, cities and towns)

3.5   Chapter Summary

The majority of staff (teachers and support staff) who had to undertake online training found it disengaging and typically viewed it as a 'tick-box' exercise. Whereas, face-to-face training was preferred because it allowed staff to ask follow-up questions. While the majority of teachers and support staff across most colleges felt training helped to improve awareness of Prevent, some teachers lacked confidence in approaching Prevent due to discomfort in discussing sensitive issues. Thus, further practical training in addressing difficult conversations would be useful. Those GFE colleges that employed agency staff and worked with subcontractors and partners found overseeing training challenging because agency staff were paid only for teaching hours which resulted in low levels of engagement with training and complying with the Prevent duty is not a legal requirement for subcontractors and partner organisations.

4 Implementing the Prevent duty: 1. Educating Learners

One of the key elements of enacting the Prevent duty is to educate learners about extremism, its causes, and how to protect themselves. This involves raising learners' awareness of associated issues, and informing them who to approach if they have concerns. As part of the duty, colleges are also required to have a clear strategy for embedding British values into formal and informal curricula and are asked by Ofsted to demonstrate how their work with learners is effective[41]. The following chapter analyses these strategies, and their effectiveness from the perspectives of those interviewed as part of this study.

4.1 Teaching approaches to engage learners

4.1.1 Creating the right learning environment

Although a combination of different teaching methods were implemented by all GFE colleges to educate learners about Prevent issues such as the ideas associated with the concepts of extremism and radicalisation, the main narrative of lessons was consistent across GFE colleges, and that was about keeping learners safe. The focus of lessons and tutorials was creating the right environment where learners were able to express their feelings without fear of reproach. In practice, this meant creating the right, non-judgemental atmosphere to allow an open discussion of issues, ensuring balance in the coverage of issues (i.e. not concentrating solely on one aspect of radical / extreme activity) and contextualising discussion within real, familiar situations to learners.

For example, one teacher stated creating the right environment exposed learners to different cultures and beliefs, and subsequently contributed to self-development and community awareness.

> "So, [we cover] different beliefs in tutorial… we go through different areas, what their community feels, and we're trying to break down the myths, so that each individual [feels comfortable to] talk about their beliefs."
>
> *(Staff, other area, cities and towns)*

---

[41] HM Government (2015) Prevent Duty Guidance: for further education institutions in England and Wales. London.

4.1.2 Teaching British values

All learners were educated on British values, although the manner in which colleges approached this subject differed because of staff and senior leaders' perceptions of the term in some GFE colleges. Some teachers, support staff and senior leaders in some colleges struggled to distinguish a British value from common societal values. For example, 'democratic values' were not always viewed as something uniquely British, but as a feature of any functional society. In other cases, senior leaders said that their staff and learners were uncomfortable with the term 'British values' due to perceived negative connotations with far-right ideology (covered in more detail later, see 'Challenges', pg.47).

To engage staff and learners, some GFE colleges reframed Prevent topics in order to address concerns around the term British values. College leaders in these colleges adapted terminology and associated content using less divisive phrasing such as 'preparing learners for life in modern Britain', which broadly addressed the concerns that some teachers and support staff had. These changes were also reflected in the approach taken with learners with educational materials that focused on exploring how their personal values related to their life goals and wider citizenship.

> "… [I]t's more about preparing you for life in modern Britain [instead of British values]. We put it on the back of, 'If you want to be successful in modern Britain, these are the things you've got to show.' Obviously, what sits really nicely now is Prevent. It's a far more acceptable way for them to talk about it."
>
> *(Staff, priority area, conurbation)*

Senior leaders from GFE colleges that implemented such an approach said they saw a positive response as staff members found it easier to integrate British values into their lessons. Leaders reported higher levels of learner engagement as a consequence.

4.1.3 Covering Prevent in lessons

All GFE colleges typically used two broad types of content when delivering Prevent education: using standardised materials which were either authored centrally or adapted from materials created by external bodies; and/or asking departmental or teaching staff to develop and integrate Prevent and British values into their lessons and/or the subject curriculum. These were choices made by senior leaders who had responsibility for implementing a college's duty. These choices were influenced by a variety of factors such as, amongst others, the available budget within the safeguarding team, the staff resources available, the size and diversity of the student body and the views of staff towards Prevent.

In almost all GFE colleges where teachers were given the opportunity to integrate Prevent and British values into their lessons, the mechanism through which Prevent topics were delivered varied. Delivery methods included dedicating elements of their course to Prevent (i.e. a piece of coursework or presentation on the Prevent strategy) through to lessons around specific issues.

The extent to which Prevent could be embedded in lessons depended on the subject being taught, as some subjects lent themselves better to the topic. For example, learners studying health and social care, public services and politics were more likely to cover Prevent-relevant topics, than learners studying mathematics or physics. Examples given by learners and staff during case study visits included:

- Child safeguarding and customer engagement activity for nursery nurses on work placements;

- Direct teaching of Prevent legal and regulatory topics for learners studying public services and courses related to policing and law enforcement;

- The impact and perception of policies addressing radicalisation or extremism such as Prevent as part of politics courses; and,

- The historical parallels between the purpose of Prevent policies and right-wing radicalisation/extremism[42] of other nations as part of modern history.

Learners of these subjects tended to be more knowledgeable of Prevent and the different types of extremist behaviour. They usually had a better-developed understanding of Prevent issues and were able to discuss concepts more eloquently than other learners who learned about Prevent through standardised safeguarding non-classroom methods.

In most cases, bespoke Prevent material was not delivered in all curriculum areas in a GFE college, especially where decision-making for delivery was devolved in part to curriculum staff. Centralised / standardised materials were used in the absence of bespoke lesson plans.

4.1.4 Covering Prevent in tutorials

The majority of GFE colleges had dedicated Prevent tutorials and/or learner induction sessions for learners that formed part of a wider pastoral programme. These were offered in addition to covering content in course lessons (both academic and vocational), which as discussed earlier varied by course subject and teachers' confidence in

---

[42] Right-wing extremists are those who support ethnocentric and nationalist ideologies and oppose immigration.

embedding Prevent into the curriculum. For this reason, tutorial/learner induction sessions were typically a more formalised approach across all GFE colleges in addressing Prevent.

Prevent tutorials and learner inductions either involved a presentation from the tutor followed by a discussion, or an online course (e.g. ETF's Side-by-Side) where learners independently learnt about extremism and radicalisation, which was then followed by a questionnaire to assess learners' understanding. ETF's Side-by-Side modules were used by teachers to deliver training to learners. The modules were often used as part of the learner's induction into the college and views of the online modules were mixed. Some staff commented that these modules were useful as they covered some of the key aspects of Prevent, whilst also providing them with a platform from which to build their own curriculum content. However, improvements could be made to materials to make them more engaging and relevant to learners. Some learners and staff described online modules as a tick-box exercise; in one GFE college, learners said they were told they could leave the classroom once the module was completed and they consequently viewed the module as something they had to complete rather than information with which they should engage. Although a presentation was better received, learners could recall little of the content's detail when questioned. The information they could recall included practical information such as reporting concerns rather than theoretical knowledge (definitions of extremism and radicalisation).

Training on how to stay safe on the internet and through email was also delivered to learners in all colleges, though this was typically in the form of an introductory session at the beginning of term. Most GFE college leaders said they re-visited induction sessions, although the frequency with which they did so varied from college to college.

The safe use of social media was covered less in learning and the few colleges that did so covered the topic in little depth. Some teachers across some GFE colleges said their level of knowledge (and interest in) social media was less than many learners. In addition, the social media landscape is constantly changing and some teachers said they were personally less able to keep up to date with new platforms. Some senior leaders and teachers said this made it difficult for them to keep up with learners who were more adept and interested in social media. Furthermore, one teacher mentioned that although they had dedicated a small part of their lesson to addressing social media and its relation to fake news, there was not much appetite amongst learners to understand the relationship, perhaps since these platforms were primarily used to communicate with their peers and friends.

> "…but then after a while, you get a little bit of fatigue with the kids, 'Oh not this, I don't want to do this.' A few of them just said to me, '[staff member], you don't understand, I don't watch the news.'"

(Staff, priority area, conurbation)

Another teacher reported a successful way of engaging learners was to create displays as part of tutorial activity. One senior leader said this allowed learners to express their own opinions and how Prevent and British values impacted them based on their own research into the associated topics. It was also a method of starting conversations in the classroom, particularly in subjects where it was more difficult to integrate Prevent content.

> "What does work, one of the induction activities is to create a display for Prevent and British values in every department, so the learners and staff do that themselves. They can introduce an issue, then create a display about how the values apply to them...That then means the learner's work is up on the wall, and it doesn't feel as preachy."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

4.1.5 Wider information provision on Prevent

GFE colleges also attempted to increase engagement by experimenting with non-classroom methods of delivery. Visual aids were popular, with posters, leaflets and computer screensavers used across all the colleges to outline information on keeping safe and contact details of the safeguarding team. Some GFE colleges also conducted poster competitions.

All learners were aware of these wider communication efforts, but as learners were rarely directly affected by Prevent issues, the majority said they rarely engaged with communication materials and so they found it difficult to recall the information.

> "It doesn't matter how many times and how many posters we have in class, if you sit a learner down and ask what British values are or what our Prevent strategy is they'll go 'I don't know.'"

(Staff, other area, conurbation)

As illustrated in the following case study (B), to increase learner engagement and awareness one college involved learners in spreading awareness on Prevent issues to other learners.

Case Study B

Learners at a priority area college took an active role in various activities to help inform their peers on Prevent issues and British Values. During a previous inspection, Ofsted had commented on the lack of student knowledge around Prevent and British values within the college. As a result, the college introduced a mixed method approach of educating learners. These included:

1. Developing posters about Prevent and British values which are displayed around the college for other students to see.

2. Using Q & A sessions to educate younger peers.

3. Performing plays to other learners which focus on different events associated with radicalisation and extremism such as the murder of Jo Cox and a demonstration by National Action.

The purpose of using these approaches as well as tutorial/pastoral packages were to encourage learners to actively use the information they had learnt from tutorials to produce materials to aid understanding. Alongside being an informal approach of testing knowledge and awareness, it provides learners an opportunity to openly discuss and debate issues. One learner described this approach as the most useful form of learning, since a certain level of understanding is required to teach others.

> "I think having to perform about it because then you really have to understand what it is. If you're educating someone else on it then you have to know what it is yourself to be able to do that."
>
> *(Learner)*

Other methods employed by a minority of GFE colleges to engage learners included visits from police officers and other high-profile learner-friendly individuals who come in to run workshops and give talks, and drama productions created by learners on the topic of Prevent and counter-extremism. Some GFE colleges also employed engagement officers, whose role was to interact with learners and staff, with the aim of detecting issues among learners and flagging any concerns with other members of staff. These individuals were usually highly visible and often well known to learners.

> "We also have safety and engagement officers in the college, and we also have our security staff. Those safety and engagement officers are our staff who go around the corridors, we get the boys who loaf about outside the refectory, on the radiators. Our safety and engagement officers engage with those learners. It's

very softly-softly. You're looking for signs of miscreants and naughty behaviour, but you're also looking for signs of, 'Is that boy alright? Is that girl okay?'"

The thinking behind this method of engagement was that learners may be unwilling to open up to teaching staff regarding issues, and would feel more comfortable speaking to someone with whom they could interact on an adult-to-adult rather than teacher-to-learner basis.

4.2   Challenges

4.2.1 Developing rapport and confidence

A number of challenges in delivering material to learners on Prevent and British values were described by staff and senior leaders. Some teachers were concerned they lacked confidence in their classroom skills to deliver content on a sensitive topic which was distinct from the subject they taught. In many cases, safeguarding teams received additional, detailed training relating to Prevent and wider safeguarding concerns because of their professional roles in the college. Members of safeguarding staff across all GFE colleges were much more likely to learn more about the Prevent and Channel process and need more detailed knowledge of the wider processes involved with referrals. They also had day-to-day conversations with other staff and students about Prevent and other safeguarding issues and were therefore comfortable dealing with issues surrounding extremism and radicalisation. Conversely, teachers were far less likely to receive in-depth training on wider Prevent processes and their dealings with students on Prevent related issues were infrequent. Some teachers and support staff across some GFE colleges said this is why they were less comfortable with unfamiliar situations leading to limited confidence in their abilities. They also had concerns that they could offend learners when discussing topics about which they were unknowledgeable.

> "From the teacher's point of view, they find that they are sometimes difficult discussions. They do not want to offend anybody. We've had to do a little bit of work on having difficult discussions, which I don't think we're finished with. We need help with that."

Low confidence was an issue for a substantial number of teaching staff across many GFE colleges. Newer teachers often struggled with discussing issues around Prevent as they said they had less rapport with learners compared to their longer-serving colleagues. Further, some older teachers struggled to relate to learners on Prevent issues. Whilst some staff members believed they would develop rapport with time and

experience, they still felt that training on tackling difficult conversations would help them to develop the necessary communication skills sooner.

4.2.2 Covering Prevent concepts

A related challenge highlighted by some teaching staff was how to approach concepts such as British values with learners from Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds. It was presumed by some teachers these learners may have cynical views due to experiences of discrimination or wider right-wing connotations associated to the term. Some learners from BAME backgrounds reported incidents of racism and subsequently questioned the appropriateness of British values and felt it should be called 'human values'.

So with some teachers regarding the term 'British values' as having right-wing connotations, there was concern about using the phrase in inner city GFE colleges because of the cultural diversity of learners; using 'British values' could alienate learners that experienced racism. In one GFE college, teachers said learning from other teachers' experiences in having these sensitive discussions with learners from BAME backgrounds would have been helpful since it would inform them about approaching potentially sensitive issues.

There were also issues around engaging learners in mainly white communities who saw extremism as a matter that did not affect them, or had no relevance. Some senior leaders and teaching staff in these areas said some learners perceived extremism as an issue only affecting Muslim communities.

> "One of the things we get in this area is, 'Why do we need it? We haven't got a Muslim population.' Actually, we do need it."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

Learners in these areas often recognised the influence of mainstream media focus on radicalisation and its links to Islamist extremism. In discussion, these learners were often less aware or made fewer spontaneous comments regarding other forms of extremism such as the far-right and environmental extremism. Learners in more culturally diverse, inner city GFE colleges were typically more aware of different forms of extremism compared to learners in other colleges.

4.2.3 Embedding content in lessons and tutorials

Some teachers in almost all colleges where senior leaders wanted to teach Prevent issues in class struggled embedding Prevent and British values into lessons, though these problems varied by subject (see also *Covering Prevent in lessons*, pg.42). As

noted earlier, the curriculum goals and content in some subjects directly relate to Prevent, radicalisation, extremism and safeguarding. However, in other subjects, often those with highly technical or strong occupational content, relating learning aims to Prevent issues is much harder because little or no common ground exists. Some teachers across most GFE colleges in this situation said they received little guidance on how to embed Prevent into lessons or found it more difficult as they were not used to teaching topics outside their usual curricula.

> "For me, a big thing is I'm not an expert in it so it's difficult for me to spot certain situations I could embed it in, so I'm saying I don't see it but that's probably because I'm not an expert in it and I'm not particularly looking for it."

(Staff, other area, cities and towns)

Providing staff and learners with consistent Prevent messages was a challenge in larger GFE colleges. Only a few larger colleges had a set tutorial programme and many relied on a set of common materials which tutors and departments could tailor for their learners. This led to inconsistent pedagogical approaches to teaching Prevent and variance in the quality of delivery.

Similarly, as discussed in the previous chapter, staff stated it was challenging delivering content to apprentices who spent more time with employers. Whilst it was easier in the classroom environment to introduce a topic or generate a discussion, it was more difficult to deliver in the workplace where colleges had little control over what information was covered. Some GFE colleges tried to address this issue by sharing guidance with employers, but as they have no legal obligation to deliver Prevent, this was challenging.

The following example case study (C) outlines how one college approached supporting teachers to embed Prevent into their lessons. The findings suggest that teachers would like more support and training in this area.

Case Study C

A GFE college in a non-priority area has employed an approach that supports teachers in embedding Prevent into the curriculum (of both academic and vocational courses). The initiative was designed to contextualise Prevent education to ensure all learners would benefit from tailored approaches that would in return increase engagement. The college adopted a two-tiered approach to educating learners. The first tier comprised a general overview of Prevent through tutorials, inductions, posters and events, which all other case study colleges adopted as part of their formal and informal learning. The second tier involved contextualising learning for different subject areas since senior leaders recognised that the needs of students following different curricula are diverse. The college created 'Prevent champions' in each subject to help teachers embed Prevent into the curriculum. The 'Prevent champions' were responsible for:

1. Identifying different methods to contextualise Prevent in their subject;

2. Supporting curriculum staff to embed Prevent into their lessons; and,

3. Outlining key learning activities for learners around Prevent, British Values and Personal Social Development (PSD) throughout the academic year.

"Each champion within [looks] at the best ways of taking [Prevent] information and building something and delivering it. A construction or a motor vehicle student is very, very different to an A-Level Geography student or an Art Design and Media student".

(Senior Leader)

4.3 Areas for consideration

4.3.1 Developing materials for target learner groups

Some teaching staff across the 20 GFE colleges requested additional support/materials to tailor content for learners based on their educational level. For instance, some teachers had to devise materials and approaches to teach English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) learners due to language barriers. Staff already worked long hours and had a wide range of other responsibilities and could consequently resent further administrative work which is typically completed outside of contracted hours. For learners on lower level courses, Prevent topics were covered in smaller groups in one GFE college so that learners could ask more detailed questions about more difficult concepts (such as the political, cultural or religious backdrop to radicalisation and extremism) that more academically gifted learners could grasp more easily. They felt that this delivery

improved the effectiveness of learner interaction as smaller group sessions afforded learners opportunities to ask questions and clarify content.

> "What we've done is we have a main programme and presentation that's delivered to all learners that's pitched at a level. Then, with our low-level learners, it's more delivered within their class content, so that they can have a bit of a deeper understanding, and sometimes quite one-to-one, as well. We just deliver it in a different way."
>
> *(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)*

To approach developing additional materials more efficiently, GFE colleges could share their materials with others. However, as discussed earlier, at present this was limited since some senior leaders across some GFE colleges reported there was an element of competition between colleges that are assessed by Ofsted.

4.3.2 Adapting the content of training and teaching materials

Existing staff training and the function elements of tutorials and inductions for learners were focused on reporting behaviour changes and safety. However, a number of learners and staff across some GFE colleges said they would prefer more information on why some people may turn to extremist behaviours. This could be why the more involved approaches to Prevent (presentations, external speakers, curriculum-related content, and projects, etc.) were better received since it used examples grounded on factual, real-life experiences.

Furthermore, lesson materials were sometimes made more engaging by using media such as videos on Prevent, radicalisation and extremism topics. Methods such as videos and guest speakers helped some learners understand the different concepts linked to Prevent if they struggled to absorb such information through traditional teaching methods.

> "Sometimes, learners get very disengaged as well, but because it's quite interactive and its short snippets with activities, it really worked actually."
>
> *(Staff, other area, conurbation)*

One way to improve engagement was to ensure content for learners was relevant to them. Some senior leaders and teaching staff recognised the value in content and support material that was contextualised in, or reflected the circumstances of the local area.

> "If you start with something a young person just can't engage with they'll automatically dismiss it. Whereas if you can contextualise it and make it relevant to them you can then build upon it."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

The context in which the material was delivered was an important way to engage learners, with staff reporting a higher level of awareness among learners around significant events in the news like the poisonings in Salisbury[43], or the attacks in Manchester[44] or London[45].

However, the current reporting mechanisms in nearly all GFE colleges visited work well. The awareness of what to look for in general terms is high, staff and students typically know who to go to if they see something that concerns them and the route of escalation to making a decision on a Channel referral also works well. The resources that would need to be used to deliver high-level, content-rich training for all may not justify any relatively slight improvements that could be made to the quality of reporting processes.

4.3.3 Using external speakers

Another method to remove some of the burden on staff in developing suitable Prevent materials and content was inviting expert trainers into the GFE college. In addition, external experts can help staff develop approaches to improve learner engagement on Prevent issues such as managing difficult conversations. One GFE college has trialled this approach alongside delivering other safeguarding content via expert practitioners.

> "We're changing our tutorial model this year to incorporate tutorial experts. What we're finding is some of our construction teachers might not be as confident of teaching these kinds of subjects as they are in construction or engineering. So, we're now getting tutorial experts, so they become experts on sexual health or sexual exploitation or radicalisation."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

---

[43] On 4 March 2018, a former Russian military officer and double agent for the UK's intelligent services, and his daughter were poisoned a Salisbury.
[44] The Manchester Arena bombing was a suicide bombing attack in Manchester on 22 May 2017.
[45] There have been several attacks in London, including the London Bridge attack in 2017, where a van was deliberately driven into pedestrians and a terrorist attack took place outside the Palace of Westminster.

4.4 Chapter Summary

In all GFE colleges, tutorial and induction programmes were designed to provide the basic level of information in relation to extremism and radicalisation to enable learners to report changes in behaviour or any Prevent concerns. Staff and students were also consistent in describing the sorts of behaviours or actions that, if observed, would lead to them informing a suitable member of staff. However, staff and learners did not always engage with tutorials or inductions because of their perceived perfunctory nature. The standardised nature of much of this provision was not always contextualised in a local setting, or followed themes that resonated with learners.

Teachers faced two main issues in delivering Prevent in lessons. Firstly, Prevent-related issues and topics suit subjects that cover cultural, political and safeguarding matters. It is therefore easier to embed learning into these curricula compared to technical or directly vocational subjects. Secondly, a number of staff said they were uncomfortable discussing radicalisation and extremism with learners because their own knowledge in these areas was lacking, or because the interpretation of topics such as British values were highly subjective. A number of senior leaders said they had altered relevant phrasing in their strategic documents and lesson plans to address this issue.

5 Implementing the Prevent duty: 2. Reporting processes

The second key element in enacting the Prevent duty is ensuring robust reporting processes are in place within colleges that enable Prevent issues to be dealt with appropriately. This chapter provides an overview of reporting approaches, attitudes towards these structures from the perspectives of senior leaders, teachers, support staff and learners and their effectiveness in dealing with issues that fall under the Prevent duty.

5.1 Referral process overview

All senior leaders stated they have implemented a structured, 'hierarchical' reporting system, where all staff (teachers, support, administrative and other staff) report to their line manager and/or safeguarding officers, who then escalate to safeguarding/Prevent leads as deemed necessary. As illustrated in the quote below, one senior leader stated this allows for appropriate support mechanisms to be present in GFE colleges to support teachers in safeguarding their learners.

> "It's a hierarchy […] You have safeguarding and wellbeing staff who would feed up into our head of service, who would feed up into our assistant principals, who's then head of service […]. So, it's quite structured and integrated into the support mechanisms."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

Although, the structured approach is similar, only one GFE college had implemented 'progress coaches' within each curriculum who would be the first person teachers and other staff would report to, who would subsequently investigate and escalate to senior management as deemed appropriate.

As discussed previously, Prevent is viewed as a safeguarding issue. Accordingly, all GFE colleges have utilised their safeguarding referral structure that was in place prior to 2015, to appropriately report and manage Prevent enquiries. Pertinently, all senior leaders in all the participating GFE colleges reported safeguarding and wellbeing staff as the most competent and suitable to deal with Prevent issues; since the aim of their role is to deal with safeguarding matters and subsequently they received the highest level of safeguarding training. As demonstrated in the quote below, one senior leader indicated that at their college senior leaders encouraged staff to report any concerns to the safeguarding team who are fundamentally responsible for further investigation allowing them to make informed decisions on interventions including wider referrals i.e. Channel.

> "We follow it like any other safeguarding referral, which is if you have a concern, it's not your responsibility as a staff member to do that investigation, it's bring them down to the safeguarding team, allow us to do that intervention, liaise with the proper authorities as timely as we need to do."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

From a senior leader perspective, the majority felt that the value of employing a system that was familiar to their college staff ensured reporting Prevent issues was not burdensome, but a process that was 'normalised' and thus implemented with ease; teachers and support staff are reminded of the reporting structures through training.

> "We do use the policy and the process to report things through. It's just in the DNA really, it's a normal thing as part of safeguarding if we've got concerns about X, Y and Z then it goes through the safeguarding process."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

The majority of GFE colleges require all staff to complete a form to report Prevent issues to their safeguarding team, while others have an electronic system for this process. Despite the slight variations in reporting systems, all senior leaders specified that each Prevent issue was dealt with on a case by case basis where response and management was dependent upon the nature of the concern reported. As demonstrated in the quote below, this could entail a simple conversation with the learner or require further investigation prior to making a decision if the police or a referral to Channel needs to be made.

> "We'd ask them to fill in a form and have a discussion with a designated safeguarding member of staff and we'd take it from there. They might phone me, I might say there's not enough there, I need you to find out X, Y or Z, or we'll take it from here...Depending on the nature of the concern we might decide we want to have a discussion with the learner, find out more information, we may decide we need to bring the parents in, depending on the age group. We may also get some intelligence from the police to see whether they've got any concerns. So, we gather a lot of information, assess that information, depending on where the concerns come from and then we'd make a decision."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

Some senior leaders emphasised that by building good rapport with the local authority and police, they felt well-supported in making decisions regarding Channel reporting, usually through informal conversations. Those senior leaders who had wider networks prior to the duty being introduced or since were proactive in seeking help and building rapport through sitting on external committees and/or board meetings benefitted from their wider connections.

"I feel really well supported by our Prevent police team and by our local authority.
I wouldn't worry about picking up the phone or asking, clarifying anything."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

5.2   Channel referrals

All but one GFE college had experience of making a Channel referral and all senior leaders emphasised that external Prevent referrals were overwhelmingly low in comparison to other wider safeguarding issues.

"It will be low in comparison to everything else. This year, I think we've had two in the wide scheme of all the others."

(Senior leader, adjacent area, cities and towns)

For all GFE colleges, directors and/or safeguarding leads were responsible for making contact with Channel representatives in the local authority. The majority of senior leaders stressed that Prevent enquiries were dealt with, with a sense of urgency from both the college staff and Channel. Although Prevent referrals were low in numbers, occurrences were viewed as high risk, resulting in them being dealt with immediately.

"Directors and deputy directors are responsible for reporting to Channel. The schools process involves a reporting form which is escalated to the safeguarding team, if needed sent to channel and [they] 'immediately action that', [and then] they would communicate information back."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

There was also an overwhelmingly positive response to Channel, with many senior leaders describing their support as essential in dealing with Prevent issues. Channel provided necessary support to learners in a timely manner and communicated information back to the colleges. One senior leader cited that Channel representatives recognised that dealing with referrals was a joint-partnership between themselves and college leaders.

"[When making a referral to Channel] they're really keen to listen to us and respect our involvement."

(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)

5.3   Staff attitudes

All types of staff (teachers and support staff) reported that they were confident with the reporting structure due to it being both familiar and normal practice to discuss

uncertainties with other members of staff. As a result, staff across all GFE colleges felt that no changes were necessary with reporting structures, since it seemed to work well.

All teachers across all GFE colleges were told to report Prevent issues to the safeguarding team since it was not their responsibility to investigate these matters. However, some senior leaders from a few GFE colleges emphasised this resulted in an initial peak in issues that were escalated in the early days of the duty. A couple of senior leaders found that although teachers were confident in reporting other safeguarding matters, they were less confident about Prevent issues since they lacked specialist knowledge. These colleges found that staff would escalate trivial matters and as a result, initially, Prevent matters were viewed as increasing safeguarding staffs' workload. However, with time and training it appears that teaching staff are becoming more confident in assessing situations and making informed decisions on what is appropriate to escalate to the safeguarding team.

> "Obviously we noticed a slight increase in [internal] referrals. Prevent was around before the Prevent duty came out, so we've been conscious of Prevent, but with more staff training and awareness […] It's petered off now and plateaued."
>
> *(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)*

One senior leader reported that different types of staff will approach Prevent referrals according to their experience and training. For example, administrative staff who do not have regular contact with learners were more likely to report any issue or concern since they were less likely to be confident approaching learners whereas other teaching staff were more comfortable discussing Prevent related issues with learners and questioning situations. While all senior leaders agreed that all members of staff have a safeguarding responsibility, perhaps additional support and training is required among non-teaching staff to increase their confidence in approaching Prevent concerns.

> "I think if you talk to people in admissions or back office functions, even though we do say, 'We all work here, we all come into contact with learners, we've all got a responsibility,' they might not feel confident. I think that they would probably be quick to put a referral in if they saw anything that was unusual or question something. I think staff would question it."
>
> *(Senior leader, priority area, cities and towns)*

On the whole, the majority of staff (both teachers and support staff) agreed and stated with training and experience over time they were generally becoming more confident in making decisions about which concerns require reporting. If a situation arose where they were unsure, they are confident with the reporting system and would seek for clarity and further support.

5.4 Learner reporting processes

Similar to staff, the majority of GFE colleges followed the same reporting structure for learners, who were encouraged to report any concerns to their tutors, safeguarding or wellbeing teams or any other member of staff, dependent on their preference.

However, a few GFE colleges have implemented unique methods of communication, primarily to ensure their methods encourage reporting among young adults. These methods were introduced on the assumptions that learners who live in a 'digital age' would prefer alternative methods of communication. For example, three senior leaders from different GFE colleges reported they have a 'report it' button on the Moodle system that learners can use to report issues and are subsequently dealt with by the welfare and safeguarding teams. This approach, takes into consideration that learners may not feel comfortable speaking to someone face-to-face. Other GFE colleges may not have this approach since it requires a financial investment.

> "We do have a Moodle system, on the front page there's a stay safe icon and anybody can refer for any form of help."
>
> *(Senior leader, other area, cities and towns)*

Another GFE college had implemented a 'safe text' approach where learners can anonymously report any concerns they have to the safeguarding team. This is beneficial for those who may not want to be identified by staff or viewed as perhaps 'snitching' on their peers. It is important to note that the aforementioned two systems were in place not only for issues relating to Prevent, but also for wider safeguarding matters.

> "We have a safeguarding team, […] and they can go to anyone of those. If they prefer, they can come to a manager, and then we'd contact the safeguarding team. Learners can either go to the safeguarding, or there's a text or email system they can contact. The text number is posted all around the College."
>
> *(Staff, other area, cities and towns)*

Lastly, one senior leader reported that their GFE college has benefitted from employing younger staff among their safeguarding team. As a result learners are able to build rapport with them that they may not have with older teaching staff. Also, it is presumed by the senior leaders at this college that the informal nature of these relationships encourages learners to come forward and report any concerns that they may have.

Typically, learners were informed of the reporting process during their induction period, through presentations and tutorial sessions, to ensure learners were aware of the support available and in return colleges were meeting their safeguarding duty.

> "We inform our learners as part of their induction. It's everywhere. The way we do it is seamless. If someone comes to a teacher, you follow your protocol, you're listening, but once that referral's made, if it's not high up on the agenda, it's seamless, safeguarding take over."

(Staff, adjacent area, cities and towns)

Additionally, a common practice among all participating GFE colleges was to display posters on site informing learners of their safeguarding officers; while some colleges had this information displayed on all learner lanyards. These methods were crucial for those colleges that had multi-sites since each campus had designated safeguarding officers. The majority of learners across all colleges felt that these approaches were helpful, but often went unnoticed since Prevent issues did not directly affect the majority of learners.

> L1: "I'm not too sure how it works, I haven't really read the posters."
>
> L2: "There's one on the back of the toilet door with the, 'Ring the safeguarding team number,' that's more college specific."

(Learner, adjacent area, cities and towns)

On the whole, despite low levels of knowledge on extremism and radicalisation, the majority of learners across the 20 case study GFE colleges highlighted that they were aware of the reporting system utilised at their college and were confident about who to speak to if they did have a prevent/safeguarding issue. Additionally, most of the learners in almost all of the GFE colleges recognised the seriousness of Prevent issues and subsequently stated they would report any concerns they had to ensure their peers and other learners were protected.

> "I know I can speak to my tutor and say 'I need to speak to somebody, can you send me in the right direction?' and she would."

(Learner, adjacent area, cities and towns)

However, some learners at one GFE college stated they were less likely to report concerns since they had little trust in the college system or the police to deal with issues of extremism or terrorism; despite the GFE college having employed new mentors/staff to improve learner engagement. These learners felt that the college staff (safeguarding and counselling team) did not care, which was reportedly linked to previous experiences of not being treated fairly. Another learner felt, they would be labelled as a 'snitch' amongst their friendship group and that concerns would not be dealt with by the college. This indicates previous experiences may influence whether or not learners choose to report Prevent matters to the appropriate staff at their college. Also, consistency across managing wider safeguarding and other learner concerns could be valuable in building trust among learners.

L1: "There probably is, we're just not going to access [counselling] anyway… [the college] aren't going to do anything, they don't care, they're only here to earn their money."

L2: "No, the woman treats you like a four year-old child. I wouldn't chat to her."

L3 "It doesn't get sorted, you just get called a snitch."

(Learner, priority area, conurbation)

5.5 Chapter Summary

Since Prevent reporting processes were embedded in safeguarding procedures, they have worked well across all GFE colleges with safeguarding and wellbeing staff fundamentally having responsibility in dealing with Prevent concerns. External support gained once external referrals were made from Channel and the local authority have been overwhelmingly positive among senior leaders. However, those who were proactive in building rapport and seeking help clarifying Prevent-related issues also benefitted during the investigation process by having opportunities to informally discuss concerns with their wider connections. Some senior leaders indicated that staff who do not have regular contact with learners i.e. administrative staff, lack confidence in making decisions about Prevent concerns and report all worries. This can be burdensome for safeguarding staff and thus additional support and training is required.

6 Impact

In this chapter, the evidence is used to assess the overall impact of the ways in which GFE colleges have implemented the Prevent duty on their learners and staff. This is discussed in terms of safeguarding and awareness as described by learners, then staff (senior leaders, teaching and support staff).

6.1 Learners

6.1.1 Safeguarding

The majority of learners expressed that they were confident with the reporting system within their colleges and recognise that the Prevent duty is primarily concerned with their wellbeing and safety. Although, physical security is not a requirement of the Prevent duty, the wider physical illustrations of safeguarding issues reinforced messages of keeping safe and of learners' responsibility in contributing to their own safety, for example by wearing ID badges.

> "When I came here it was quite a big difference because I'd never really had [Prevent] mentioned to me before in education. The fact they check ID badges and having the doors locked so that people can't get in is a good thing."
>
> *(Learner, priority area, cities and towns)*

Most learners made connections between wider media and cultural coverage of radicalisation and extremism with their physical environment when questioned. However, there was a mix of views expressed about the wider impact on their behaviour. How safe a learner felt was based on a combination of factors of which wider college safeguarding (and, by extension, Prevent) were one element. Their personal views and individual reaction to media coverage, for example, was very dependent on individual psychology. Those with direct exposure to extremist behaviour (e.g. the Manchester Arena attack) were more concerned about safeguarding than their counterparts with no such experience. .

> "It's nice to know that the government is doing something because if you're just constantly seeing this and this has happened in the news and you didn't think the government had anything in place, I think you'd be more scared. I think this gives you some kind of, like, relief or some kind of hope that things would get better."
>
> *(Learner, priority area, urban major conurbation)*

However, in nearly all GFE colleges, most learners said they felt safe and, were open to reporting any concerning behaviour they saw from others.

"I think it's good to be aware of it, and I think everyone should be aware of it. I think generally I feel quite safe where I work, and where I study, and at home, and the area that I live in."

6.1.2 Awareness

Whilst educating learners had positive impacts on their ability to identify and willingness to report safeguarding issues; the majority of learners across participating GFE colleges said they had a limited understanding of radicalisation and extremism concepts. Learners typically cited that they did not feel engaged during their Prevent tutorial programme or pay attention to posters since they are not personally affected by these issues. Extremism is an ephemeral issue for most learners rather than something they think deeply about. Many learners' defined extremism and radicalisation as terrorism or violence and their views echoed the portrayal of terrorism from the media, including social media.

L1: "I feel like I know but I don't, I'm not too sure. I don't know if it's related to terrorism".

L2: "The over-exaggeration of terrorism. I think radicalisation is more to do with, like, the vulnerable people and stuff like that".

L3: "I understand that extremism's like violent acts in the name of something else. I don't know if that is always religion".

L4: "Terrorists, like, the bombings".

(Learners)

Those learners who had a better developed understanding of extremism and radicalisation tended to be:

1) Doing courses that lend themselves to further discussions on extremism and radicalisation e.g. health and social care, public services who were also more likely to have more sessions and extra-curricular activities on extremism and radicalisation.
2) Learner representatives or those that work closely with learner services have more training and/or attend board meetings with staff. Such learners were sometimes an important component of wider intelligence networks (formal or informal) in college safeguarding teams.
3) Those that have been directly affected, or knew people affected, by the Manchester/London attacks.

For the majority of teachers interviewed, learners need to know enough to keep themselves safe. Teachers reported the most important element of their responsibility in

complying with the duty was for learners to know how to report anything that concerns them. The majority of teachers were confident that since their colleges had begun to enact the Prevent duty through educating learners and reporting systems, learner awareness had increased to a level required and suitable for safeguarding.

> "It's increased their awareness around issues generally, not just within the college but within society generally, in terms of how to deal with particular incidents and issues, how to keep themselves safe, how to minimise the risk of them being at risk of potential radicalisation and terrorism."

(Senior leader, priority area, conurbation)

Learners' breadth of knowledge about extremism and radicalisation was generally limited (with a few exceptions of learners that had quite extensive knowledge based on project work). The mechanisms used to educate learners varied from online Side-by-Side tutorials to detailed project work (e.g. performances). Below, is an example of one college (Case Study D) that had informal testing in place to assess learner awareness of context on extremism, radicalisation and British values.

Case Study D

A GFE College in a non-priority area used qualitative methods to measure awareness of Prevent and British values amongst their learners. At the college, ensuring that learners have a sufficient understanding of Prevent was delegated to directors across faculties. Each curriculum programme undergoes an internal review (similar to the inspection given by Ofsted) in which a group of randomly selected students are asked questions by members of senior management to gauge their understanding on Prevent and British values. Subsequently, the information was utilised to produce actions plans for learners who demonstrated a limited understanding. Follow-up reviews were undertaken to measure the impact of the change in methods.

> "We have reviews, where each director has almost like a mini Ofsted, so then there will be a group of students that are questioned by the senior management team to identify their understanding. We've action planned if we felt that the students didn't demonstrate the right understanding."

(Senior leader)

It has been recognised by the majority of staff and learners that enacting the Prevent duty, in particular discussing radicalisation and extremism during tutorials and lessons, has given learners the opportunity to openly discuss and debate issues that they otherwise would not have discussed or debated within the college. This allows concerns from all parties to be raised and, as noted elsewhere, a platform to talk about the issues

has some impact on learners' awareness as well as helping to improve the confidence of staff to deal with any issues they face.

> "It gave time for the learners to have the discussion rather than saying it's an hour Prevent session. […] For some of our learners it sparked some things with them, where they'd experienced online bullying or potentially grooming. I had learners come to me at the end, I was then able to offer support if they wanted it or signpost them."

> *(Staff, other area, conurbation)*

High profile events (for example, the Manchester Arena attack) influence perceptions of issues connected to Prevent and make policies more salient to learners. Learners reported that the Manchester attack drew their attention for two reasons; firstly it occurred outside of London and secondly, targeting young children or even events they were considering attending raised awareness of the potential risk for young adults. This implies for education to be impactful, the content needs to be more relatable by ensuring it is localised or incorporates recent events that learners can identify.

> "Events such as the Manchester bombings have increased learners' awareness of terrorism, radicalisation etc. [...] it certainly was an event that had our kids talking in a way that the attacks in London wouldn't have."

> *(Staff, priority area, conurbation)*

6.2   Senior Leaders, Teaching and Support staff

6.2.1 Safeguarding and existing perceptions of Prevent

Embedding Prevent within safeguarding has enabled the Prevent duty to be implemented in colleges within tried and tested systems of safeguarding, which reportedly work well with regards to Prevent. Similar to other safeguarding processes, the majority of senior leaders, teachers and support staff across all GFE colleges expressed confidence in being vigilant and keeping learners safe by having an awareness of extremism and radicalisation. Although there were challenges with the implementation of British values, in relation to the terminology, the overall outcome seems to be positive with a promotion of respect, equality and diversity among learners.

> "I think the British values have really given us the opportunity to drive up those, the ethos of equality and diversity again. The [name] campaign based on the British

values, we have seen a reduction in bullying, and we've seen a reduction in hate crime."

(Staff, priority area, conurbation)

The introduction of the Prevent duty has also given some staff the opportunity to approach sensitive discussions with learners. This is an important aspect of the duty in that it brings issues covered by Prevent (extremism and radicalisation) into the open which, in turn, can have a positive impact on the wider reporting of Prevent. Senior leaders reported that general wider criticism of the Prevent agenda in targeting particular groups had an impact on teachers' perceptions in the earlier phases of implementation. By placing Prevent under the umbrella of safeguarding, discussing issues with learners helped to remove some of the stigma and pre-conceptions that staff associated with Prevent's often poor media profile. This was especially the case where the cultural, religious or racial background of staff was different to that of some of the learners they taught.

> "Being in a classroom with such a mix of religions and ethnicities, I think this is something we've developed as teachers, not being afraid to have the discussion. From a teacher's perspective, facilitating that discussion and not being afraid to say 'how does that make you feel?' Allowing them to have their say and say they're Muslim and that's not what religious teachings tell them."

(Staff, other area, conurbation)

While these sensitive discussions with learners have increased some teachers' confidence in discussing difficult issues with learners, other teachers reported they lacked confidence in doing this due to a lack of experience, concerns about managing difficult conversations, and the lack of frequency in discussing these issues.

6.2.2 Information Technology

All GFE colleges had internet monitoring systems in place to identify risk activity amongst learners. These ranged from off-the-shelf applications and programmes to monitor their network, external services operated by consultants or bespoke applications managed by central staff. The IT monitoring systems typically provided reports to the safeguarding team as requested and, in many cases, a member of the Central IT Team would sit on the college safeguarding committee. These individuals would typically undergo more involved Prevent training to better identify relevant issues that could be raised on the internet. Using this training, they could then create the right search terms and/or algorithms to effectively identify appropriate terms that would be flagged by computer systems if searched and subsequently investigated further if used by learners.

IT support staff also played an important role in wider Prevent reporting in many GFE colleges. They were able to monitor activity either through their own observations or those of learners. Such observations could then be triangulated with search histories to further investigate any concerns.

Observational activity is also the only real way to monitor social media. Many GFE colleges highlighted this as a problem because it cannot be remotely managed. Social media forms a significant barrier in the wider reporting process. For example, one college only discovered a group of learners discussing extreme right-wing ideologies because a learner reported a concern to a member of staff based on a post on their Facebook wall. This example highlights the importance of open and trustworthy reporting mechanisms as part of a Prevent strategy.

> "The only thing I've had concern with is this use of social media, and you can't really police that. Once you've got social media, people can get infiltrated a lot easier, so we've got to keep our eyes and ears open much more in the classroom to spot if anyone is being subjected to any external forces."
>
> *(Staff, other area, cities and towns)*

6.2.3 Administrative burden and resourcing

Prevent duties have time and cost implications. This can result in trade-offs between other priorities. One strong rationale for embedding Prevent within safeguarding is that the policy can be delivered using existing support and reporting mechanisms. As all GFE colleges visited had a safeguarding team with an existing administrative and reporting network, adding Prevent to safeguarding made sense to ensure management and delivery was efficient. The specialists required specifically for Prevent could be created through additional training and subsequently limited hiring and/or partnership development.

In a few cases, the resources put into Prevent were viewed by some senior leaders as disproportionate compared with those available for other areas of safeguarding e.g. grooming. In particular, senior leaders from two colleges were concerned that issues that affect many more learners than Prevent in their colleges (mental health, wellbeing, learner hardship, other criminal activity, etc.) were under-resourced by comparison. A few staff also drew a conclusion about the level of funding based on the quick response times from the local authority, Channel and the police associated with referrals, inferring that the speed of response (within hours) implied significant resource underpinning the policy.

> "I think in regard to Prevent, I don't think it actually is a huge concern for us... [Our] focus is very different. It is around gangs and knife crime. Even the community and the learners that come through, we've done huge things around radicalisation

and extremism, and learners are aware of these issues. It's not something that affects them, it's not for us a huge concern. We talk about it, and obviously staff and learners are aware of how they need to alert us, but in all honestly we're not going to make an issue of something that doesn't really exist for us, to an extent."

(Senior leader, priority area, cities and towns)

Therefore, these senior leaders felt they were legally obliged to invest time and money in addressing Prevent since it was reviewed through Ofsted inspections. Prevent is not an everyday issue; in relation to risk, the likelihood of incidence is very low, but the consequence is very high. Thus, they would prefer to have more autonomy in making decisions on priorities for their colleges.

6.3   Chapter Summary

To summarise, whilst educating learners reportedly had positive impacts on their ability to identify and report safeguarding issues; the majority of learners had a limited understanding of radicalisation and extremism concepts. In the main, for teachers this was sufficient since the priority was on learner safety. By placing Prevent under the umbrella of safeguarding, discussing issues with learners helped to remove some of the stigma and pre-conceptions that staff associated with Prevent's often poor media profile. In addition, the introduction of the Prevent duty has increased some teachers' confidence in approaching sensitive discussions with learners, but for others (typically newly qualified or staff who have little learner contact) it continues to cause discomfort. Overall, some senior leaders felt they were both legally obliged and pressured to invest time and money in addressing Prevent since it was reviewed through Ofsted inspections. These senior leaders suggested removing such pressure and having more autonomy in deciding where time and funds should be spent would be more impactful for addressing specific pertinent issues for their colleges.

7   Conclusions

7.1   Processes of Prevent within General FE Colleges

All staff acknowledged that Prevent was viewed as part of safeguarding, which leads Prevent activities to be taken seriously. Whilst some staff training was perceived as perfunctory, the central reporting mechanism of Prevent was broadly clear to staff and learners. GFE colleges gave good examples of how they gathered intelligence to inform referrals. Universal knowledge amongst the staff and learners of the concepts behind radicalisation and extremism is not necessary knowledge to refer issues.

7.2   Practices of embedding the Prevent duty and support

For senior leaders, Prevent policy and strategy documents informed a strategic plan and the approach to its implementation and management. Senior leaders reflected on policy development as a legal obligation and thus all colleges said it was a necessary requirement for them to deliver. In interviews, other staff primarily focused on the practical aspects of Prevent such as reporting and having conversations with learners. Their key concern was ensuring learners were safe and framing Prevent activity in this way was perceived by senior leaders, teachers and support staff as an effective way of communicating core messages and actions.

On the whole, approaches to policy and strategy developments were similar across all colleges, with the primary difference being external support. Crucial factors that influenced approaches were the size of colleges (factoring in multi-sites and learner population) and the connections senior leaders had with Prevent coordinators, local authorities and other GFE colleges and schools in their local area. Prevent and Channel are multi-agency approaches and GFE colleges that approach policy development as such have effective partnership arrangements in place. High quality external speakers and/or extra-curricular activities exploring Prevent issues are better at raising awareness of Prevent concepts than formulaic approaches such as online training / exercises. However, in larger colleges where teachers adapt Prevent materials (see pg. 51), senior leaders raised concerns over consistent messaging, quality of teaching and difficulties associated with delivering a cohesive Prevent package to learners. It appears, senior leaders struggle to strike a balance between allowing teachers freedom to teach Prevent in their own way, and ensuring a consistent approach across colleges.

Staff training was defined as a key statutory element in the duty guidance for GFE colleges. Training records are currently the way colleges document that their staff are competent to enact the Prevent duty, typically through WRAP training. As such, this

study echoes the findings reported by Ofsted (2016) that found GFE colleges were making good progress in enacting the Prevent duty, but providers were over-reliant on staff completing online training packages for Prevent. For instance, this study found while, online training delivered to staff was generally informative, senior leaders used it as tick-box exercise to evidence their compliance of the Prevent duty during Ofsted inspections. On the whole, all training programmes, regardless of delivery provide an overview of Prevent combining issues related to extremism and radicalisation and reporting structures, but have limitations in addressing practicalities of discussing Prevent with learners. A key barrier for some staff is they are not confident instigating difficult conversations with learners. However, confidence grows with experience. Mechanisms that facilitate staff-learner conversations about Prevent concepts reportedly helps to break down pre-conceptions and cultural barriers. Such mechanisms include bespoke training, workshops, learner-led projects and planned / managed tutorial time.

Accordingly, confidence is described as a key challenge in educating learners alongside others (also found by Busher et al. 2017). Staff report learners on the whole are not engaged with Prevent education for two important reasons: salience (Prevent has a very low incidence albeit high-risk issue); and, in very limited cases, cultural barriers underpinning a reticence to discuss Prevent. These two issues can make it difficult to impart issues about extremism and radicalisation to learners because of disinterest or some hostility. Three approaches have been identified that can reportedly improve learner engagement:

- Utilising interactive teaching methods;

- Events or content hosted or delivered by external speakers;

- Improving current training materials to make them more relevant and relatable to learners.

Overall, GFE colleges have implemented the Prevent duty by using and adapting existing safeguarding procedures. Despite limited understanding of extremism and radicalisation, the majority of learners in all bar one GFE college were in the main confident with the reporting structures in place. GFE colleges have effectively implemented Prevent policies via safeguarding mechanisms and learners typically understand how to report any concerns around extremism and radicalisation.

7.3   Impact on learners

The key impacts of implementing the Prevent duty on learners that this study found can be summarised as follows:

- The majority of learners feel safe and would report concerning behaviour.

- Despite developing and implementing training programmes for learners, understanding(s) of extremism and radicalisation generally - for most learners - echoes the media portrayal (in relation to terrorism).

- As there is a lack of testing knowledge and understanding amongst learners within the majority of colleges, approaches to learner education is rarely altered. Perhaps, exploring the impact of different approaches to teaching and learning on learner knowledge and understanding would be beneficial for future approaches to learner education.

- Implementing the Prevent duty has provided learners with an opportunity to openly discuss issues.

Appendices

Sampling GFE Colleges

GFE colleges were the focus of the study. The most recent Edubase data was used to identify 192 colleges for sampling. Note that Edubase was slightly out of date due to sector mergers. For the purpose of sampling, colleges subject to mergers were retained and one site was selected for convenience by principles (only two cases).

The stratification variables for sampling were as follows:

1. Prevent priority areas (from 2014/15), Local / Unitary Authorities were identified. Colleges within these areas were flagged. Furthermore, colleges in LAs/UAs adjacent to older priority areas were also identified. This created a three tier priority area classification:
   a. College in older priority area (31 colleges);
   b. College in LA / UA adjacent to an older priority area (40 colleges);
   c. College outside of a priority area (121 colleges).
2. Ofsted rankings (as per the most recent published all college figures from 28th February 2017) were appended to the Edubase list.
3. Finally, colleges were stratified by the ONS Urban Rural classification.

It was important to disproportionately stratify based on priority area because there was a focus on gaining a breadth of institutional experience based on the likelihood of enacting Prevent duties. A measure of likelihood is complex including demographic, cultural and behavioural factors. However it was reasonable to assume that colleges within priority areas were more likely to enact duties than those without.

Table 2 below, outlines the sample that was available by comparing priority area classification with the last published Ofsted rating. The table provides the population data and the suggested number of interviews (target case studies). This was based on having at least 4 colleges sampled for each target cell. Hence, as there were only 11 colleges in areas adjacent to a priority areas, the maximum number that could have been achieved was two case studies.

In reality, this distribution, including the skew towards better Ofsted ratings, meant all colleges in priority and adjacent areas were invited to take part in the study. In the case of non-priority areas, these colleges were randomly assigned into four groups mostly comprising 30 colleges (one had 31).

Table 2 Sample of colleges

Within, or adjacent to, Priority Areas	Population - Ofsted ratings for relevant performance measures			Target case studies		
	Outstanding / Good	Requires improvement / Inadequate / no data	Total	Outstanding / Good	Requires improvement / Inadequate / no data	Total
Priority	18	13	31	3	3	6
Adjacent	29	11	40	4	2	6
Non-priority	83	38	121	4	4	8
Total	**130**	**62**	**192**	**11**	**9**	**20**

Briefing for College Lead

This document provides detailed guidance on setting up a one-day site visit at your college for the research study on Prevent and Counter-Extremism in Further Education. We would like to thank you in advance for your help and assistance.

What is the purpose of the study?

This research has been commissioned by the Department for Education (DfE) and is being carried out by CFE Research. DfE wishes to know more about how FE colleges have approached and responded to the Prevent duty, and the impact on students. The research will collect information and views from senior leaders, teachers and relevant support staff (who may be approached by students to discuss these issues), students and other partners. This will help DfE understand whether the FE sector has the support, training and resources it needs.

What approach will we take?

The research will be qualitative in nature, which means we are conducting in-depth research with specific audiences of interest. We are interested in interviewing the following audiences:

Audience	Method	Guideline interviews / groups (n)	Guideline interview length (duration; min)
Senior leaders	Interviews / paired depths as appropriate	2	60 minutes
Teachers/ relevant support staff	Mini-focus groups of 4 to 5 people	3 in total; 2 with teaching staff, 1 with support staff	60 minutes
Learners	Shorter interviews/ paired friendship groups	8	45-60 minutes

What support do we need from you?

Your support is critical to the success of the research. With guidance and support from a researcher at CFE we would like your help to plan and arrange a one-day site visit at your college. We will ask you to:

- Recruit the above audiences to take part in the research. To reduce the burden, CFE Research will provide you with all the necessary communication materials.

- Arrange logistics of the one-day site visits. This means organising a room / rooms for interviews / focus groups and to tell participants where they need to be. A member of CFE Research will provide sample day plans that you could follow should you wish to, but we are flexible and will accommodate the college's and participants' needs. This means the audiences we suggest above can be changed, as can any timings if they better meet your needs.

The site visits

Two researchers will visit your college and we envisage they will be on site from 9am till 5pm. However, we are flexible on these timings and will arrange the day to best fit with your requirements. Each researcher will conduct each focus group/interview separately and we would like to conduct a maximum of 12 to 13 sessions, split between the researchers. However, we appreciate this requires some organisation and we are happy to do fewer sessions if that fits better with the college's requirements.

Below is a sample of what the day may look like. Please note we are flexible and will try our best to accommodate the college's and participants' needs.

Time	Researcher 1	Researcher 2
9:00 – 10:00	Senior Leader Interview	Senior Leader Interview
10:15 – 11:15	Teacher mini-focus group	Teacher mini-focus group
11:30 – 12:30	Learner interview	Learner interview
12:30 – 13:00	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK
13:00 – 14:00	Learner interview	Learner interview
14:00 – 15:00	Learner interview	Learner interview
15:00 – 16:00	Learner interview	Learner interview
16:00 – 17:00	Support staff	

Although our preference would be to complete as much fieldwork as possible during the site visits, we understand that this may not be possible with busy schedules among staff.

In situations where staff are unavailable to take part in an interview on the date arranged, we will conduct telephone interviews prior or after the site visit.

Ideal learner profiles

DfE would like us to gather information from a learner sample that includes students across different subject areas i.e. academic and vocational and inclusive of a range of demographic factors. These include:

- Gender

- Ethnicity

- Religion

- Migration Background

- Broad political orientation

Understandably, these will vary according to the wider locality demographic profile and thus we suggest you treat these suggestions as a guide rather than hard and fast rules. If helpful, CFE Research can provide advice and guidance on recruiting learners.

Teacher Sample

We would like to interview teachers who teach different subjects i.e. academic and vocational.

Next steps

Your designated contact at CFE Research will provide you with all the necessary communication documents needed to start planning the site visits. If you have any immediate queries about what is required or wish to discuss any difficulties you foresee then please contact CFE Research: <INSERT EMAIL>.

Factsheet for FE college leader

It is important you understand the purpose of the study, and what participation involves before you decide if your college should take part in this research. Please carefully read the following information. If you would like to help DfE by participating, or have any further queries please contact CFE Research.

What is the purpose of the study?

The statutory Prevent duty came into effect for further education (FE) providers in September 2015. Since this point, providers have been required to safeguard their students from being drawn into terrorism. In addition, providers are expected to promote fundamental British values in their curriculums.

This research has been commissioned by the Department for Education (DfE) and it is being carried out by CFE Research. DfE wishes to know more about how FE colleges have approached and responded to Prevent requirements. The research will collect information and views from staff, students and other partners. This will help DfE understand whether the FE sector has the support, training and resources it needs.

What will be required of my college and me?

We would like to carry out a one-day site visit to your premises, on a date convenient to you. Two CFE researchers will visit the college and conduct interviews separately with senior leaders, teachers and support staff and students. We will take every care to minimise burden and disruption.

To arrange this, we ask that you nominate a key contact to liaise with CFE Research and help organise a day that best suits the college. This person will provide CFE Research with the necessary information and administrative support to make the day as smooth as possible.

Each interview will last around 45-60 minutes and the researcher will ensure each potential participant is fully informed about the project before agreeing to participate. The researchers will emphasise to those involved that there are no right or wrong answers, and that we are interested in participants' opinions and experiences. Each individual also has the right to refuse to answer any questions and the right to withdraw their consent at any point during or after completing the interview. It is important to note that although you may consent to your college being involved, the researchers will also seek further and informed consent from each potential participant and emphasise that taking part is voluntary.

What questions will researchers be asking?

Researchers will ask participants a range of questions to understand your college's experience of the Prevent duty. The exact questions will vary depending on the individual, their position and their responses, but typically will focus on their understanding of Prevent in terms of policy and practice, successes and challenges of implementing the duty and impacts on both staff and students. This is **not** an inspection and there are no right or wrong answers: we need individuals' thoughts and experiences.

How does my participation help?

Your contribution will improve DfE's understanding of the Prevent duty in the FE sector, which in turn will help shape the support given to colleges. Participation means you, other staff at the college and students have the opportunity to share your experience and express your views and opinions about an important issue. This is invaluable in shaping DfE's agenda.

The research will also collect best practice examples from colleges, with a view to collating, describing and promoting these for the benefit of all FE providers.

The research findings will be anonymised to ensure that no college or participant is identifiable and the findings will be published on the gov.uk website. Participating colleges will be informed by e-mail when the report is published.

How will CFE Research and DfE deal with the sensitivities involved in this area?

Both DfE and CFE Research recognise the sensitivities involved in the discussion of issues around terrorism and extremism.

The CFE team members carrying out the research are qualified social researchers who follow the ethical and procedural framework laid out by the industry's professional body, the Market Research Society. CFE research has also received ethical clearance from the DfE and will operate within Government Social Research ethical guidelines. All CFE researchers have considerable experience conducting interviews and group discussions on a variety of sensitive issues. All research conducted in the course of this project will follow strict ethical guidelines. Participants will be kept fully informed of the research process and made aware that participation is strictly voluntary. Participants will not be required to say anything they do not want to or that makes them feel uncomfortable. All personal data will be kept confidential (see below).

CFE's researchers are experienced and trained in what to do if a participant becomes distressed. In addition, there will be a strict protocol in place if any participant makes a disclosure, which gives rise to safeguarding concerns.

Will data collected be kept confidential?

Yes. We will follow ethical and legal practice in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. CFE processes are compliant with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) that come into force in May of this year. All information about you, the college and other participants will be handled in confidence unless there is a disclosure amounting to immediate danger of serious harm to self or others.

Access to identifiable data (name, college, etc.) will be limited to the research team. This information and other personal details will not form part of our data analysis and will not be included in any published report. Personal data will not be kept longer than is necessary for the purpose of the research. On completion of the research, data will be disposed of in a confidential manner and computer files permanently deleted from all systems.

Both DfE and CFE Research take the use of ethical guidelines in research very seriously. If you have an enquiry about ethics or wish to make a complaint, then please contact: (contact details)

Who will have access to my information?

Any personal details will only be accessed by the CFE Research team.

How will researchers collect and use data from interviews?

With your consent, we will audio record and transcribe interviews to aid analysis. All information captured will be held confidentially by CFE Research only, and all the information participants provide will be anonymised before being used in reports. This means it will not be possible for anyone to identify participants through research outputs.

Can I change my mind later?

Yes. It is entirely your decision for the college, its staff and students to take part in this research and any potential participant can change his or her mind at any point. If you change your mind, none of the information given by any participant to that point will be used. However, to remove content we must receive instruction before the report is published. If the college or any participant decides they would not like us to use responses after the visit, then please contact (contact details).

Who can I contact for more information or if I would like to take part?

If you have any questions, please email (email address)

Factsheet for FE college staff

Before you decide you wish to take part in this research, it is important you understand its purpose and what participation involves. We would be grateful if you could take the time to carefully read the following information. If you are willing to participate, please let <INSERT LEAD COLLEGE CONTACT NAME> know, or contact (contact details).

What is the purpose of the study?

The statutory Prevent duty came into effect for further education (FE) providers (including colleges) in September 2015. Since this point, colleges have been required to safeguard their students from being drawn into terrorism. In addition, colleges are expected to promote fundamental British values in their curriculums.

This research has been commissioned by the Department for Education (DfE) and is being carried out by CFE Research, a not-for-profit company. DfE wishes to know more about how colleges have approached and responded to Prevent. As part of the research, we would like to collect information and views from staff like you as well as learners. This will help DfE understand whether colleges have the support, training and resources they need.

What will be required of me?

As part of a site visit to your college, two CFE researchers will conduct interviews on site with senior leaders, teachers and support staff and students. We will organise this at a time convenient for you to minimise burden and disruption. For staff, we would ideally conduct research in groups (focus groups) of four to five people. However, if you are more comfortable talking about this topic in a single interview, we are able to do so.

CFE Research is working with <INSERT LEAD COLLEGE CONTACT NAME> to organise the site visit.

Each focus group will last around 60 minutes (single interviews may be a little shorter) and we're happy to provide more information about the study to you on request. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your opinions and experiences. Similarly, you are free to decline to answer questions if you want to and leave the group / interview at any point if you wish. Taking part is voluntary and we will gather your express consent to participate prior to the starting the group / interview.

What questions will researchers be asking?

Researchers will ask you and colleagues a range of questions to understand your experience of the Prevent duty. The questions will cover what you understand about Prevent in terms of the policy and how it is implemented in practice. We will cover what

group participants think works well as well as the challenges you face implementing the duty. The group will also cover the important topic of how Prevent impacts college life for staff and students. To reiterate, there are no right or wrong answers: we're interested in your thoughts and experiences.

How does my participation help?

Your contribution will improve DfE's understanding of how the Prevent duty operates in colleges, which in turn will inform the nature and structure of the support the government provides to the FE sector. Participation means you have an opportunity to share your experience(s) and express your views and opinions about an important issue. This is invaluable in shaping DfE's agenda.

The research will also collect effective practice examples from colleges, with a view to collating, describing and promoting these for the benefit of all FE providers.

How will CFE Research and DfE deal with the sensitivities involved in this area?

Both DfE and CFE Research recognise the sensitivities involved in the discussion of issues around terrorism and extremism. The CFE team members carrying out the research are qualified social researchers who follow the ethical and procedural framework laid out by the industry's professional body, the Market Research Society. CFE Research has also received ethical clearance from the DfE and will operate within Government Social Research ethical guidelines. All CFE researchers have considerable experience conducting interviews and group discussions on a variety of sensitive issues. All research conducted in the course of this project will follow strict ethical guidelines.

Your participation is voluntary and you are free to change your mind about participating whenever you like, even directly before or during the research activity. We limit any personal data we collect to that which is valuable for analysis. All personal data will be kept confidential (see below).

Will data collected be kept confidential?

Yes. We will follow ethical and legal practice in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. CFE processes are compliant with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) that come into force in May of this year. All information about you will be handled in confidence and in line with GDPR.

Access to identifiable data (e.g. you name, your role) will be limited to the research team. This information and other individual personal details will not form part of our data analysis and will not be included in any published report. Personal data will not be kept longer than is necessary for the purpose of the research. On completion of the research,

data will be disposed of in a confidential manner and computer files permanently deleted from all systems.

Both DfE and CFE Research take research ethics very seriously. If you have an enquiry about ethics or wish to make a complaint, then please contact (contact details).

Who will have access to my information?

Any personal details will only be accessed by the CFE Research team.

How will researchers collect and use data from interviews?

Only with your consent, CFE Research will audio record and transcribe focus groups to aid analysis. Recordings are made only if every person in the group agrees. All information captured will be held confidentially by CFE Research only, and all the information participants provide will be anonymised before being used in reports. This means it will not be possible for anyone to identify you through research outputs.

Can I change my mind later?

Yes. It is entirely your decision to take part in this research and any potential participant can change his or her mind at any point. If you change your mind, none of the information you give to that point will be used. However, to remove content we must receive instruction before the report is published. If you decide you would not like us to use responses after the visit, then please contact (contact details).

Who can I contact for more information or if I would like to take part?

If you have any questions, please talk to either <INSERT LEAD COLLEGE CONTACT NAME> at the college, or email (email address) directly.

Factsheet for FE college learners

Before you decide to take part in this research, you need to understand why it is being done and what it involves. Please read the following information.

What is the purpose of the study?

Your College has agreed to take part in a study by the Department for Education (DfE) that is being carried out by CFE Research. This study is looking at how colleges deal with issues around extremism and radicalisation associated with the Prevent duty. As part of the duty, colleges have in place ways to protect their students from being drawn into terrorism. It is important to note you do not need to know much about the Prevent duty or extremism to take part.

As part of the study, we would like to collect views of students like you on your experiences of extremism and radicalisation and how and to what extent your college helps students to deal these issues. This will help DfE understand whether colleges have the right support, training and resources they need.

What will be required of me?

We will be asking your college to arrange either one-to-one interviews, or joint interviews with a couple of friends depending on what you prefer.

Each interview will last around 45 minutes and will be arranged to suit you. The interviews are not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in your thoughts and experiences. You can choose not to answer any questions you don't like and are free to leave the interview at any point if you wish. Taking part is voluntary. We will ask you to sign a consent form before the interview which shows you are happy to talk with us.

What questions will researchers be asking?

Researchers will ask you questions to understand how you learn about radicalisation and extremism in classes, as well as how the college deals with extreme ideologies and radicalisation. The interview will also cover your awareness and experience of what your college does if students report extreme or radical behaviour at college. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers: we're interested in your thoughts and experiences.

How does my participation help?

Learning what you and other students think will improve DfE's understanding of how your college safeguards and informs students of extreme or radical behaviour. In turn, the research will help the college understand how to best support students. Participation also

means you have the opportunity to share your experiences and express your views and opinions about an important issue.

How will CFE Research and DfE deal with the sensitivities involved in this area?

Both DfE and CFE Research recognise discussing issues around terrorism and extremism can be difficult. The CFE team members carrying out the research are qualified social researchers. CFE research also follows Government Social Research ethical guidelines.

You will only take part if you want to and you are free to change your mind about participating whenever you like, even directly before or during the interview. We limit any personal data we collect to that which is valuable for analysis.

Will my data collected be kept confidential?

Yes. All information captured will be dealt with in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which means it will be kept confidential unless you disclose that you, or someone else, are in immediate danger of serious harm.

It is important to note that all data collected is confidential i.e. your teachers will not know what you have said during the interviews. Access to identifiable data (e.g. your name) will be limited to the research team and will not be included in any published report or made known to your college. On completion of the research, all data and computer files will be permanently deleted.

Both DfE and CFE Research take research ethics very seriously. If you have an enquiry about ethics or wish to make a complaint, then please contact a member of college staff or (contact details).

How will researchers collect and use data from interviews?

With your permission, CFE Research will audio record and transcribe your interview to help their analysis. All information will be held confidentially by CFE Research only, and all the information you provide will be anonymised before being used in reports. This means it will not be possible for anyone to identify you through the research.

Can I change my mind later?

Yes. It is entirely your decision to take part in this research and you can change your mind at any point. If you change your mind, none of the information you give to that point will be used. The report will be published in August 2018 which means we can only remove your information from analysis if we are told by July 2018. If you decide you would not like us to use responses after the visit, then please contact (email address).

Who can I contact for more information or if I would like to take part?

If you have any questions or would like to take part, please talk to either <INSERT LEAD COLLEGE CONTACT NAME> at the college, or email (email address) directly.

Senior leader topic guide

Interview details

The **research aim** today is to understand your views on the Prevent duty.

The **purpose of the interview** today is to gather your views on the ways in which your college has addressed their duty in relation to Prevent. Specifically, today we will be asking you about:

- An overview of your student population, the community and the risks of radicalisation and extremism in your area;

- How Prevent is embedded in the college and what it looks like in practice;

- What support and training you've used, and whether it was useful;

- What has worked well/less well and any difficulties in implementing the Prevent duty and promoting British values;

- Any impact of interventions on you, college staff and students;

- What support you would like in this area.

The interview will be conducted according to the Market Research Society Code of Conduct, meaning it is conducted ethically and your data will be protected. We expect the interview to last approximately 45 minutes to an hour. It is important to note that there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers, it's your thoughts and experiences that we are interested in.

You have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions and you can stop the interview at any point without giving a reason. All information captured will be dealt with in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which means it will be kept confidential and all the information you provide will be anonymised before being used in reports and deleted once the report is published.

With your permission, I'd like to record the interview to assist us in understanding your responses in more detail.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Introduction and general views (5 minutes)

1. **Can you start by outlining your job role? How long have you worked at the college for?**

2. **Can you provide some background information on your college?**

   a. **What kind of courses are on offer?**

   b. **Is the college part of a merger?**

3. **Can you describe what the local population is like and what you think this means for the College's Prevent duties?**

   a. *Who lives in the local community? (E.g. family types, i.e. nuclear, single parent, political, religious and ethnic composition, ages, economic circumstances, comparison to any other colleges in the area.)*

   b. *Do you feel the student population is reflective of the local population? In what ways?*

4. **Can you describe in your words, what you understand Prevent/the Prevent duty to mean?**

> INTERVIEWER NOTE: Definition: The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 contains a duty on specified authorities (including FE colleges) to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. This is also known as the Prevent duty.
>
> This isn't a test of the interviewee. Use this definition within the interview if required to guide or contextualise a question if a correct definition is needed.

5. **What are your personal views towards the 'Prevent Duty' for colleges? Why?**

6. **Can you describe your role in relation to the College's Prevent duties?**

   a. *How much of your time does it take to manage your Prevent duty responsibilities?*

   The remainder of the interview will focus on the Prevent duty in relation to your college more specifically; it would be useful if you could provide insights on what your college has done and what support is needed in relation to addressing Prevent and protecting students from extremism and radicalisation.

College's Prevent policies (Development) (up to 10 mins)

7. **What policies do you have in place that govern your response to Prevent duties?**

   a. *To what extent are policies formalised?*

8. **What would you say have been the college's guiding principles in developing Prevent policies?**

    a. *What is it about these principles that are particularly important to the college and the development of Prevent policies?*

9. **How were the various policies developed?**

    a. *What worked well/not so well?*

    b. *If challenges were faced, how did you overcome them?*

10. **What assistance or support did you seek when designing your policies / approaches towards Prevent?**

    a. Whose support or assistance was particularly valuable? Why was this?

    b. How did you work with the local authority in relation to developing Prevent policies?

    c. How did you work with coordinators to develop your policies? (*Prevent coordinators in local authorities, FE/HE coordinator and Prevent Education Officers*)

    d. Did you seek other external support i.e. from charities, other colleges / FE sector bodies, etc.? What was the nature of this support?

11. **What does having Prevent policies mean in practice?**

    a. How are the policies used?

    b. What are the benefits/challenges?

College's Implementation of Prevent (up to 10 mins)

12. **Can you provide any examples of when the college has used its Prevent policies to address any of the operational purposes below?**

    1. *Hosting external speakers or events*

    2. *Conducting risk assessment and/or IT policies*

    3. *Guidance on staff and/or curriculum content*

4. *The purchase, distribution and/or use of learning or information resources*

a. *What was the situation and how was it addressed?*

b. *What elements of your policies worked well, and w*hat worked less well? Can you explain why with reference to specific examples?

c. *Did you refine or adapt your policies as a result of your experiences? How did you do so?* How has this worked?

13. In relation to Prevent, what is delivered in tutorials and lessons to students?

a. What governs the information you provide?

b. What is the college trying to achieve?

c. What has worked well, and what has worked less well?

d. What has been the impact of receiving this information on students? What is your view here based on i.e. informal student response?

14. Under the Ofsted requirement to promote British values, how are these integrated into lessons at your college?

a. *What works/what doesn't work? Why?*

b. *Have there been any challenges? Why?*

c. *What has the impact of this been for staff? What is your view(s) here based on i.e. staff formal/informal feedback?*

d. *What has the impact of this been for students? What is your view(s) here based on i.e. student formal/informal feedback?*

15. In what other ways does your college implement information about Prevent and British values more widely to students? Can you cite specific examples or materials that you use?

INTERVIEW PROMPTS:

a. *Letters or emails*

b. *Events*

c. *Workshops/ webinar content*

d. *Other*

INTERVIEWER NOTE: Ask if we are able to take any printed materials.

College's response to Prevent (up to 10 mins)

16. **Can you describe the training if any, your college has offered to staff regarding Prevent?**

    a. Was the training mandatory?

    b. Who provided the training?

    c. What worked well/not so well? Why?

    d. How can the training be improved in the future? Why?

17. **How do staff manage any concerns they may have about students in your college in relation to radicalisation or extremism?**

    a. *How confident do you feel in making Prevent referrals?*

    b. *What is the process for managing Prevent referrals at your college?*

    c. *What are your responsibilities in regards to the different stages of the process?*

        [Probe: ask about the process of gathering more information]

    d. *Which other staff have safeguarding responsibilities? How well do these lines of responsibility work? If not, why not? How could processes be improved?*

    e. *How do concerns raised by students fit into this process?*

    f. *Who has responsibilities for communicating with external bodies in relation to student's that have been highlighted in your Prevent processes?*

    g. *Overall, how well does this process work? What works less well? How could these processes be improved? Why?*

18. **ENSURE THIS QUESTION ASKED TO ALL LEADERS: Approximately, how many Prevent referrals has your college made annually since the Prevent duty was introduced in 2015?**

   [Interviewer: Go through each year from 2015, has it increased/decreased and why?]

   a. *To which organisations were these referrals made? If you refer to more than one external agency, what influences the decisions you make about where to refer?*

   b. *What was the rough balance of these referrals between far-right, Islamist and/or other types of extremism? If the latter, can you describe the nature of that referral?*

   c. *Can you provide any examples of what happened once the referral was made?*

   d. *What has been the impact of the referral on staff and students?*

INTERVIEWER: RECORD DETAILS BELOW

Metric	Number
Total number of referrals (state if since 2015 / by year)	
Approximate balance of referrals for: Far-right extremism Islamist extremism Other extremism (specify type)	

Working with Stakeholders (5 minutes)

19. **In addition to the referrals we discussed earlier, have you had any other experiences of working with external stakeholders when enacting/implementing Prevent duties?**

a. *In what circumstances have you worked with the following individuals or organisations:*

   - Your local authority or authorities?

   - Prevent coordinators in local authorities

   -FE/HE Coordinators (Ten across England and Wales, focusing on FE and HE sectors, employed and managed by DfE)

   - Prevent Education Officers (Forty focussed on schools, managed by DfE)

   - Other external bodies such as charities, other colleges / FE sector bodies, etc.?

b. *(IF NO CONTACT WITH THE LA) Why do you not work with the Local Authority?*

[NOTE: Ask if mentioned worked with Prevent coordinators in local authorities, FE/HE coordinator and Prevent Education Officers]

20. **How do you work with the *Prevent coordinators in local authorities/FE/HE coordinator/Prevent Education Officers* to implement/ deliver Prevent duty?**

    a. *Can you provide examples of instances where you have had to work collaboratively to implement/ deliver Prevent duty?*

    b. *Why did you feel it was necessary to work together?*

    c. *What support and advice did they provide? How useful was this advice? Why?*

    d. *How valuable is this relationship? Why?*

21. **What is the most useful advice or support that you received in delivering your Prevent duties?**

    a. What was particularly valuable about this advice or support?

    b. Can you give an example of how any particular advice was used to develop/improve the intervention or support?

Impacts and improvements (up to 10 mins)

22. **What overall impact do you think your college's response to the Prevent duty is having on students as a whole at your college?**

   a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why – with reference to specific examples?*

   b. *What do you think the drawbacks have been, or could be? Why – with reference to specific examples?*

   c. *What changes in behaviour or views have resulted from interventions to this point? How have you come to identify these changes? Can you provide examples?*

23. **What impact do you think Prevent responsibilities are having on staff at your college?**

   a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why?*

   b. *What do you think the drawbacks have been, or could be? Why?*

24. **What impact do you think Prevent responsibilities are having on the FE sector?**

   a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why?*

   b. *What do you think the drawbacks have been, or could be? Why?*

25. **What impact do you think Prevent responsibilities are having on wider communities e.g. the local area?**

   a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why?*

   b. *What do you think the drawbacks have been, or could be? Why?*

26. **How, if at all, has the enactment of your Prevent duties impacted on the following:**

   a. *Knowledge and understanding of the Prevent agenda and duty amongst staff?*

   b. *Students' awareness of how to protect oneself from extremism and radicalisation?*

c. *Students accessing support? (in-college support: welfare, mentoring, pastoral care and chaplaincy support; external-support: other services)*

d. *Safeguarding and risk for students at your college?*

27. How, if at all, do you think your college can improve delivery of Prevent duty?

a. *Why are these changes necessary?*

b. *What would be the impact of these changes?*

Close of interview (5 minutes)

28. Is there anything that hasn't been discussed so far that you think is important for the research to consider?

29. Do you have any further comments you would like to make?

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

College staff topic guide

Interview details

The **research aim** today is to understand your views on the Prevent duty.

The **purpose of the interview** today is to gather your views on the ways in which your college has enacted and implemented its duty in relation to Prevent. Specifically, today we will be asking you about:

- Your responsibilities (and how you see them) in implementing the Prevent duty;

- How Prevent is embedded in the college and how it informs your teaching and what it looks like in practice;

- What has worked well/less well and any difficulties in implementing the Prevent duty and promoting British values;

- Any impact of interventions on the college, staff and students;

- What support you would like in this area.

The interview will be conducted according to the Market Research Society Code of Conduct, meaning it is conducted ethically and your data will be protected. We expect the interview to last approximately 45 minutes to an hour. It is important to note that there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers, it's your thoughts and experiences that we are interested in.

You have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions and you can stop the interview at any point without giving a reason. All information captured will be dealt with in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which means it will be kept confidential and all the information you provide will be anonymised before being used in reports and deleted once the report is published.

With your permission, I'd like to record the interview to assist us in understanding your responses in more detail.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Introduction and general views (5 minutes)

1. **Can you start by outlining your job role? What subject/courses do you teach? How long have you worked at the college for?**

2. **Can you describe what the local population is like and what you think that this means for the college's Prevent duties?**

    a. *Who lives in the local community? (E.g. family, political, religious and ethnic composition, ages, economic circumstances, comparison to any other colleges in the area.)*

    b. *Do you feel the student population is reflective of the local population?*

3. **Can you describe in your words, what you understand Prevent/Prevent duty means?**

> INTERVIEWER NOTE: Definition: The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 contains a duty on specified authorities (including FE colleges) to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. This is also known as the Prevent duty.
>
> This isn't a test of the interviewee. Use this definition within the interview if required to guide or contextualise a question if a correct definition is needed.

4. **What are your personal views towards the 'Prevent Duty' for colleges?**

5. **Can you describe your responsibilities for the College's Prevent duties?**

    a. *Are Prevent responsibilities part of your job role? Did you volunteer to undertake Prevent responsibilities? Can you tell me what aspects if any, of implementing Prevent you are contracted to undertake?*

    b. *How much of your time, if any, does it take to manage your responsibilities towards Prevent?*

    c. *How do you work with colleagues to manage Prevent in the college? Do other members of staff have different responsibilities?*

Implementing Prevent policies in your College (15 mins)

6. **What is your understanding of the guiding principles of implementing the college's Prevent policies?**

    a. *In your view, what is it about these principles that are particularly important to the college?*

7. **What training did you receive about Prevent policies and how to implement the Prevent Duty?**

    a. *What was covered in the training?*

    b. *How useful did you find the training? Why?*

    c. *What, if anything, was missing from the training? Should these aspects have been included? Why?*

    d. *What skills/knowledge do you think you need to meet your responsibilities under Prevent?*

8. **What is the most useful advice or support that you received in delivering and implementing Prevent duties?**

    a. *What was particularly valuable about this advice or support? If not valuable, why not?*

    b. *Can you give examples of how any particular advice was used to deliver and implement the intervention or support?*

9. **How is Prevent/British Values integrated into the curriculum?**

    a. *Do you have a responsibility to ensure it is?*

    b. *What works/what doesn't work?*

    c. *What has the impact of this been for you and students?*

10. **Can you describe your experiences of implementing Prevent policies?**

    a. *To what extent are policies formalised, i.e. are they part of specific teaching and learning?*

    b. *What worked well? Did you have any challenges?*

11. **In what ways do Prevent policies at your college impact your professional role?**

Prevent and student interactions (20 mins)

12. **What, if any pastoral support activities does your college have in place for students as part of your college's Prevent policies?**

   a. *Were these introduced as part of your Prevent policies? Have they always existed?*

   b. *What support activities have worked well? What worked less well? Why?*

   c. *Did you refine or adapt support you provide students as a result of your experiences? Why was this necessary? How did you do so?*

   d. *Is there any support you would like your college to have in place but do not currently provide?*

   e. *What would be the benefit of providing this support? Are there any barriers?*

13. **How, if at all, are issues associated with Prevent duties communicated to students in the classroom?**

   a. *Through what learning methods/activities/materials? Can you cite specific examples or materials that you use?*

   INTERVIEWER NOTE: Ask if we are able to take any printed materials

   b. *How well do these learning methods work in a classroom environment? What works less well?*

   C. *How could communication about Prevent in the classroom to students be improved?*

14. **Are there any wider college activities or messaging that is used to address Prevent in the college? (E.g. letters or emails, events, workshops/ webinar content, other?)**

   a. *How well do these methods work? Can you cite specific examples or materials that are used?*

   b. *What works less well?*

   c. *How could college wide activities or messaging to students be improved?*

15. **How do you manage any concerns you may have about students in your college in relation to radicalisation or extremism?**

a. *How confident do you feel in making Prevent referrals?*

b. *What is the process for managing Prevent referrals at your college?*

c. *What are your responsibilities in regards to the different stages of the process?*

   [Probe: ask about the process of gathering more information]

d. *Which other staff have safeguarding responsibilities? How well do these lines of responsibility work? If not, why not? How could processes be improved?*

e. *How do concerns raised by students fit into this process?*

f. *Who has responsibilities for communicating with external bodies in relation to student's that have been highlighted in your Prevent processes?*

g. *Overall, how well does this process work? What works less well? How could these processes be improved? Why?*

[Ask if indicated in role earlier in interview]

Working with Stakeholders (5 minutes)

16. **Have you had any experience in working with external stakeholders when enacting/implementing Prevent duties?**

    a. *In what circumstances have you worked with the following individuals or organisations:*

       a. *Your local authority or authorities?*

       b. *Prevent coordinators in local authorities*

       c. *FE/HE Coordinators (Ten across England and Wales, focusing on FE and HE sectors, employed and managed by DfE)*

       d. *Prevent Education Officers (Forty focussed on schools, managed by DfE)*

       e. *Other external bodies such as charities, businesses other colleges / FE sector bodies, etc.?*

b. *(IF NO CONTACT WITH THE LA) Why do you not work with the Local Authority?*

[NOTE: Ask if mentioned worked with Prevent coordinators in local authorities, FE/HE coordinator and Prevent Education Officers]

17. **How do you work with the *Prevent coordinators in local authorities/FE/HE coordinator/Prevent Education Officers* to implement/ deliver Prevent duty?**

    a. *Can you provide examples of instances where you have had to work collaboratively to implement/ deliver Prevent duty?*

    b. *Why did you feel it was necessary to work together?*

    c. *What support and advice did they provide? How useful was this advice? Why?*

    d. *How valuable is this relationship? Why?*

18. **What is the most useful advice or support that you received in delivering your Prevent duties?**

    a. *What was particularly valuable about this advice or support?*

    b. *Can you give an example of how any particular advice was used to develop/improve the intervention or support?*

Impacts and improvements (10 mins)

19. **What overall impact do you think your college's response to the Prevent duty is having on students as a whole at your college?**

    a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why – with reference to specific examples?*

    b. *What do you think the drawbacks / unintended consequences have been, or could be? Why – with reference to specific examples?*

    c. *What changes in behaviour or views have resulted from interventions to this point? Can you provide examples?*

20. **What impact to you think Prevent responsibilities are having on staff at your college?**

a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why?*

b. *What do you think the drawbacks / unintended consequences have been, or could be? Why?*

21. **What impact to you think Prevent responsibilities are having on wider communities e.g. the local area?**

    a. *What do you think the benefits have been, or will be? Why?*

    b. *What do you think the drawbacks / unintended consequences have been, or could be? Why?*

22. **How, if at all, has the enactment of your i.e. the college's Prevent duties impacted on the following:**

    a. *Knowledge and understanding of the Prevent agenda and duty amongst staff?*

    b. *Students' awareness of how to protect oneself from extremism and radicalisation?*

    c. *Students accessing support?*

    d. *Safeguarding and risk for students at your college?*

23. **How, if at all, do you think your college can improve delivery of the Prevent duty?**

    a. *Why are these changes necessary?*

    b. *What would be the impact of these changes?*

Close of interview (5 minutes)

24. **Is there anything that hasn't been discussed so far that you think is important for the research consider?**

25. **Do you have any further comments you would like to make?**

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

Learner topic guide

Interview details

The **research aim** today is to understand what you know and think about what your college does to protect students from radicalisation and extremism. Specifically, we will be asking you about:

- What you understand about radicalisation and extremism;
- What you know and how you feel about the college's actions relating to these issues;
- What you know about the support available at the college regarding these issues;
- Whether you have any concerns about extremism and radicalisation at the college and what those concerns are;
- Any suggestions for improvement or future support regarding preventing radicalisation and extremism.

The interview will be conducted according to the Market Research Society Code of Conduct, meaning it is conducted ethically and your data will be protected. We expect the interview to last around 45 minutes to an hour. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers, it's your thoughts and experiences that we are interested in.

You can refuse to answer any of the questions and you can stop the interview at any point without giving a reason. Everything you tell us will be used in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which means it will be kept confidential and all the information you provide will be anonymised before being used in reports and deleted once the report is published.

With your permission, I'd like to record the interview so we don't miss anything you say, and so we accurately reflect what you say in the research.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Introduction and general views (10 minutes)

1. **What are the best and worse things about living around here?**

a. *If unsure, ask about what life is like, whether there is much to do in the area, whether they have lived in the area all their life or moved, etc. Questions that will make them comfortable with the interview?*

2. **What were the reasons that you chose to study at <INSERT COLLEGE NAME>?**

   a. *What was the balance between academic factors (course, grades, reputation, etc.) and personal (friends coming here, atmosphere, difference to school, etc.)?*

3. **In your words, (it's okay if you don't know) what do you understand by the terms extremism and radicalisation?**

   a. *Can you describe any examples?*

   [Ask if the student mentions Prevent]

   b. *Where have you heard about Prevent? What do you understand by Prevent?*

Definition: Prevent is about the college's duty to safeguard vulnerable individuals from being drawn into terrorism. These issues cover any type of extreme ideology that is against the values of mutual respect and tolerance towards others, the freedom of expression and belief, democratic freedom and the rule of UK law. Colleges' responsibilities towards Prevent, or their "Prevent duties", are legislated in The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015.

4. **How serious or trivial is extremism and radicalisation as an issue to you personally?**

   a. *Why do you think that way?*

5. **Have you experienced any contact with/any awareness of extremism in your day to day life?**

   a. *Can you describe the situations?*

   b. *How did this make you feel?*

   c. *What has been the impact of these experiences?*

6. **Do you feel extremism/radicalisation is something <INSERT COLLEGE NAME> needs to take seriously?**

a. *What do you think are the main issues the colleges face? Why?*

b. *In your view, how are the issues you describe best addressed by the college?*

Now that we have started thinking about your college, the remainder of the interview will focus on extremism and radicalisation in the context of your college. We'll cover your views on the actions the college takes and what support is needed in relation to protecting students from extremism and radicalisation.

College's response to Prevent (15 mins)

7. **How have you learnt about issues of extremism and radicalisation at college?**

   a. *Have they sought out information in the past, or has information been given without asking?*

   b. *How are students taught about extremism and radicalisation? [Probe: in the classroom, websites, workshops, emails, seminars etc.]*

   c. *Which approach do you think works best and why?*

8. **How are issues of extremism and radicalisation discussed by staff?**

   a. *Are such issues discussed openly in lessons? If so, which ones? Can you give an example of where extremism and/or radicalisation were discussed in lessons?*

   b. *Does extremism and radicalisation form part of any tutor groups? If so, can you again provide examples of what was said?*

9. **What are the main messages the college gives about extremism and radicalisation?**

   a. *Who do you think is most vulnerable to extremism and radicalisation? Why do you think that?*

   b. *Which messages from the college do you think are the most important?*

   c. *Is there anything that the college discusses about extremism and radicalisation that you disagree with? Why do you think that?*

10. **What do you think of the support your college provides in relation to extremism?**

a. *What are the types of support provided?*

b. *How useful are the types of support?*

c. *Do you have a preference? Why?*

d. *Is there anything missing? What type of support would you like and why?*

11. Can you describe how British values are taught or discussed within the classroom?

a. *Why do you think these are taught?*

b. *What have you gained from this information?*

c. *What are your opinions towards the way this subject has been approached?*

d. *Can it be done differently and why?*

Prevent and friends (10 mins)

INTERVIEWER: This section will need some care. Depending on sensitivities, some students may think we are checking up on them. This is not what we intend at all, so students may require some reassurance as we go through these questions.

Reiterate disclosure and they do not have to reply if they do not want to.

12. Is extremism or radicalisation something you think much about outside of an interview or group like this?

d. *If no, why don't they think much about it?*

INTERVIEWER: If they are unconcerned, this is a good thing, no need to press for too much clarification.

e. *If yes, what do they think about? Would it be defined as a worry, something that makes them angry, misrepresented, scared, or some other emotion.*

INTERVIEWER: Remember we're discussing an emotive topic. Give students time and space to respond. If they do not wish to answer, that is fine and move on.

f. *Is there anything that they see or hear that may prompt them to think about extremism and radicalisation? If so, what?*

13. **Are you more or less likely to talk about extremism or radicalisation with friends, family or other people?**

    a. *If friends, how do they talk about extremism or radicalisation?*

    b. *In what different ways do family talk about extremism or radicalisation? Why do they think their family feel this way?*

    c. *Who else talks about extremism or radicalisation and how do they discuss the issues?*

    d. *What are the reasons why different people speak positively or negatively about extremism or radicalisation?*

Impacts and improvements (10 mins)

14. **In your own words, in what ways has learning about extremism and radicalisation at college had an impact on you?**

    a. *Probe: awareness of extremism and radicalisation, knowledge of who to report to, policy awareness and safety*

    b. *Has there been an impact on experiences at the college? Or other interactions outside college with family and friends? Can these be described?*

15. **Are you aware of anything teachers have done to tackle radical or extremist views in the college?**

    a. *Who did the college support regarding an issue with extremism and/or radicalisation? Students, staff, other people? Can you describe the situation?*

    b. *Do you feel the college should have responded any differently? If so, why?*

16. **Whose responsibility do you feel it is to address radical and extremist views: your college's; or other organisations and why?**

    a. *Which types of organisations should bear the greatest responsibility for tackling extreme or radical behaviours?*

    b. *What role, if any, is best for the college to take? What should be the responsibilities of other organisations when tackling extreme or radical behaviours?*

17. What can students themselves do that effectively addresses radical or extremist views?

      a. Are students responsible for anything to do with Prevent, extremism or radicalisation? If so, what?

      b. Have you had any experiences where students have addressed radical or extremist views? Can you describe these?

      c. If students are not responsible for any actions that could tackle extremism and/or radicalisation, why do you think this?

INTERVIEWER: The next two questions are potentially very sensitive, especially if talking to more than one student. Use the responses from earlier questions to gauge whether these questions are appropriate for the situation.

If there has been any tension or strong disagreement between participants, then do not ask the question.

If in any doubt, do not ask the question.

Reiterate the disclosure agreement from earlier i.e. that the responses are confidential and they are free not to respond to questions if they do not wish to do so.

---

18. Have you experienced any other students (or staff) voicing any extremist views or behaviours?

      a. If you wish to tell me, what was the situation?

      b. *How did the college respond to this situation?*

      c. *What, if anything, happened in the college as a result?*

      d. *How well do you think the college handled what had happened?*

19. Have you told the college about radical or extremist behaviours you have seen from others?

      a. If you wish to tell me, what did you say to whom? What was the situation that concerned you?

      b. *What response did you get back from the college / staff member(s) you spoke to?*

    c. *What, if anything, happened in the college as a result?*

    d. *How well do you think the college handled what you told them? Why do you think that?*

Close of interview (5 minutes)

20. Is there anything important about extremism and radicalisation that we haven't talked about?

21. Do you have any further comments you would like to make?

INTERVIEWER: If you pick up that any interviewee is worried or concerned about the topics raised, it may be the right time to ask if they want to talk to a staff member at the college. Ask the last question unless you feel it inappropriate.

22. Are there any concerns that you have that you would like me to take to a member of staff?

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

Consent form

CONSENT FORM

1. I confirm that I have read the participant fact sheet and the project has been explained to me, and that I have had the chance to ask questions about the research and about taking part.

2. I understand that in taking part, if I disclose anything that gives serious concern and that poses risk to myself or others, then this information will be passed on to the relevant authorities.

3. I understand that my taking part is voluntary, and that I am free to withdraw my consent during the interview/focus group or up until the report is published in August 2018. I also understand that I have the right to refuse to answer any questions I am uncomfortable with.

4. I have been informed that there is no known risk involved in my taking part in this study.
5. I am aware that any concerns about this study can be referred to (contact details)

6. I agree to the publication of findings as long as my details have been anonymised so that I cannot be identified from what I say.

7. I agree to the interview/focus group being audio recorded so that my words can be understood later.

Participant Signature: _____   Date: _____

Researcher Signature: _____   Date: _____

Department for Education

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:
earl.kehoe@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications